

## MICHIGAN.

William H. Goodman to be postmaster at Allegan, in the county of Allegan and State of Michigan.

John T. P. Smith to be postmaster at Clarkston, in the county of Oakland and State of Michigan.

## MINNESOTA.

Thomas M. Paine to be postmaster at Glencoe, in the county of McLeod and State of Minnesota.

Mark Swedberg to be postmaster at Luverne, in the county of Rock and State of Minnesota.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Robert Burns to be postmaster at Brandon, in the county of Rankin and State of Mississippi.

## MISSOURI.

Archie T. Hollenbeck to be postmaster at Westplains, in the county of Howell and State of Missouri.

William W. Wagner to be postmaster at Jefferson City, in the county of Cole and State of Missouri.

## NEBRASKA.

James N. Brooks to be postmaster at Rushville, in the county of Sheridan and State of Nebraska.

William Cook to be postmaster at Hebron, in the county of Thayer and State of Nebraska.

William T. Mauck to be postmaster at Wahoo, in the county of Saunders and State of Nebraska.

John F. Nesbit to be postmaster at Tekamah, in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska.

## NEVADA.

William B. Graham to be postmaster at Ely, in the county of White Pine and State of Nevada.

## NEW JERSEY.

James E. Sherman to be postmaster at Frenchtown, in the county of Hunterdon and State of New Jersey.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

James D. McKenzie to be postmaster at Milnor, in the county of Sargent and State of North Dakota.

## OREGON.

William H. Lachner to be postmaster at Baker City, in the county of Baker and State of Oregon.

Thomas P. Randall to be postmaster at Oregon City, in the county of Clackamas and State of Oregon.

James S. Van Winkle to be postmaster at Albany, in the county of Linn and State of Oregon.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Ada U. Ashcom to be postmaster at Ligonier, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania.

W. F. Balsbach to be postmaster at Bellwood, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania.

Barnett C. Fretts to be postmaster at Scottsdale, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

John Reich to be postmaster at Scotland, in the county of Bonhomme and State of South Dakota.

Delbert W. Wilmarth to be postmaster at De Smet, in the county of Kingsbury and State of South Dakota.

## VIRGINIA.

James Carter to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Pittsylvania and State of Virginia.

R. W. Garnett to be postmaster at Farmville, in the county of Prince Edward and State of Virginia.

John B. Grayson to be postmaster at Warrenton, in the county of Fauquier and State of Virginia.

William H. Parker to be postmaster at Onancock, in the county of Accomac and State of Virginia.

Thomas H. Smith to be postmaster at Manchester, in the county of Chesterfield and State of Virginia.

## WISCONSIN.

James W. Melklejohn to be postmaster at Waupun, in the State of Wisconsin.

David B. Worthington to be postmaster at Beloit, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin.

## REJECTION.

*Executive nomination rejected by the Senate March 2, 1907.*

## POSTMASTER.

## CONNECTICUT.

Joseph T. Elliott to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

## PECUNIARY CLAIMS.

The injunction of secrecy was removed March 2, 1907, from the ratification of a convention signed on August 13, 1906, by the delegates of the Governments represented at the Third International Conference of American States, continuing in force, with the exception of its third article, the convention providing for the arbitration of pecuniary claims signed on January 30, 1902, by the delegates to the Second International Conference.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 2, 1907.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24640) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish metal for a bell;

H. R. 25849. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Cherokee Shoals;

H. R. 25811. An act to authorize the Monroe, Farmerville and Northwestern Railway Company to construct a bridge over the Ouachita River and one over the D'Arbonne River, in Louisiana;

H. R. 25801. An act granting an honorable discharge to Seth Davis;

H. R. 24833. An act for the relief of the Louisiana Molasses Company (Limited) and the Louisiana Distilling Company;

H. R. 22588. An act for the relief of homestead entrymen who have paid more than the lawful purchase money;

H. R. 21091. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter on the roll of Capt. Orlando Humason's Company B, First Oregon Mounted Volunteers, the name of Hezekiah Davis;

H. R. 19751. An act to authorize the Natchez Electric Street Railway and Power Company to construct and operate an electric railway along the national cemetery roadway at Natchez, Miss.; and

H. R. 15859. An act ceding certain lands to Colorado State Agricultural College.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 25437. An act to grant American registry to the German bark *Mariechen*.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

## Senate concurrent resolution 54.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return the bill S. 5623, entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Nicholas M. Hawkins."*

Also:

## Senate concurrent resolution 53.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return the bill S. 7822, entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to William N. Bronson."*

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 8622. An act granting an increase of pension to William N. Bronson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 16659. An act to correct the military record of Tobe Holt.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 8328. An act to permit the laying of two water pipes from Bayonne, N. J., to Staten Island, New York—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 24925. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 24991. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

## ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 23551. An act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908;

H. R. 24925. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes;

H. R. 24991. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 15909. An act for the relief of the widow and minor son of Capt. Charles W. Dakin and the widow and minor children of Thomas J. Hennessy, late of the San Francisco fire department, who lost their lives while fighting a fire on board of the U. S. Army transport *Meade*.

## SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota presents a conference report, and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 25745) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 33, 57, 58, 62, 63, 65, 88, 101, 102, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 60, 61, 64, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 77, 84, 85, 86, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, and 124, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the word "available" in line 5 of said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the word "available" in line 4 of said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "for his information and action thereon;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Point Cabrillo light and fog-signal station, California: For completing a light and fog-signal station at or near Point Cabrillo, California, twenty-five thousand dollars."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, after the word "February," insert the word "twenty-sixth;" strike out the fourth line of said amendment, and in lines 6 and 7 of said amendment strike out the words "at a cost not to exceed;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For light and fog-signal station at or near the west end of the draw near the Lehigh Valley Railroad bridge at Passaic, N. J., fifteen thousand dollars."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment strike out the word "islands;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For light keepers' dwellings and appurtenant structures, including sites therefor, within the limit of cost fixed by said act approved February twenty-sixth, nineteen hundred and seven, seventy-five thousand dollars."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For completion of building, including everything necessary for occupation, exclusive of nurses' home, and in addition to the two following sums, fifty-six thousand four hundred dollars, to be immediately available."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 95 of the bill, in line 11, after the word "dollars," insert the words "to be immediately available;" and on page 95 of the bill, in line 19, after the word "dollars," insert the words "to be immediately available;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "one hundred thousand dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Road to national cemetery, Keokuk, Iowa: For repairs to approach roadway to the Keokuk, Iowa, National Cemetery, one thousand five hundred dollars: *Provided*, That the city of Keokuk improve and agree to maintain in proper repair the road leading south from the main driveway of the city cemetery to the point where the road herein authorized to be improved begins."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add after the word "appropriated," at the end of said amendment, the following: "This appropriation is made upon the express understanding that it is in full of all just claims against the United States and the District of Columbia on account of the reconstruction of said hospital, and that neither the United States nor the District of Columbia shall hereafter be called upon to pay any further sum on account of such reconstruction or debts incurred in connection therewith;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "four hundred and one thousand seven hundred dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "four million five hundred and twenty-eight thousand and forty-four dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 190 of the bill, in line 5, strike out the words "present session" and in lieu thereof insert the words "first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125,



and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said Senate amendment, amended as follows: On page 197 of the bill, in line 19, after the word "be," insert the words "approved by the Commission and then;" and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on amendments numbered 4, 10, 11, 12, 22, 68, 69, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 87, 96, 97, 98, 99, 117, and 126.

J. A. TAWNEY,  
WALTER I. SMITH,  
GEO. W. TAYLOR,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

W. B. ALLISON,  
EUGENE HALE,  
JAMES H. BERRY,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

#### STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 25745) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year 1908, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and submitted in the accompanying conference report on each of said amendments, namely:

On amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, relating to public buildings: Increases the amount for the public building at Asheville, N. C., from \$30,000 to \$45,000, as proposed by the Senate; inserts the provision proposed by the Senate relative to the expenses incident to the occupancy of the building at Cedar Rapids, Iowa; appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for additional land for the public building at Erie, Pa.; and appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the House, for the public building at Fairmont, W. Va., instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of the site; appropriates \$70,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the public building at Lynchburg, Va., and makes a verbal correction in the provision for the public building at Richmond, Va.

On amendment numbered 13: Appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a telephone line from the Umpqua River life saving station, Oregon.

On amendments numbered 14, 15, 16, and 17: Inserts the appropriations proposed by the Senate for the construction of two revenue cutters, a seagoing tug, and a boarding vessel for the Revenue-Cutter Service.

On amendments numbered 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, and 24: Makes verbal corrections in the text of the bill; fixes the compensation of three employees at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing at \$1,600, \$1,400, and \$1,200, respectively, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments numbered 25, 26, and 27: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, for a general inspector of supplies for public buildings at \$3,000, an inspector of furniture and other furnishings for public buildings at \$2,500, and an inspector of furniture at \$1,600.

On amendments numbered 28 and 29: Appropriates \$3,800,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of collecting revenue from customs during the fiscal year 1908, and repeals the indefinite appropriation for the customs service to take effect at the close of the fiscal year 1907, as proposed by the House, instead of 1908, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment numbered 30: Appropriates \$1,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,200, as proposed by the House, for expenses of local appraisers' meetings.

On amendment numbered 31: Appropriates \$540, as proposed by the Senate, for addition to the Prudence Island light station, Rhode Island.

On amendments numbered 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56 strikes out the appropriation of \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a light station at the easterly end of Gull Island, Lake Superior, Wisconsin, and appropriates for certain other light stations authorized by the act approved February 26, 1907, and for light keepers' dwellings in the sums proposed by the Senate.

On amendments numbered 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62, relating to the Light-House Establishment: Appropriates \$800,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$825,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs of light-houses; \$950,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of keepers of light-houses; \$700,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$650,000, as proposed by the House, for

expenses of buoyage; \$375,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$350,000, as proposed by the House, for lighting of rivers, and \$15,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for oil houses for light stations.

On amendments numbered 63 and 64: Appropriates for a chief of division of naturalization, \$3,500, as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment numbered 65: Strikes out the appropriation of \$50,000, proposed by the Senate, for compensation of special agents for carrying on the work of the division of naturalization.

On amendment numbered 66: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the division of information in the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.

On amendment numbered 67: Appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, to ascertain the conditions under which to refuse permission to certain aliens to enter the United States.

On amendment numbered 70: Appropriates \$720,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Senate office building.

On amendments numbered 71 and 72: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$7,500 for metal cases for the office of the clerk of the Supreme Court, and \$3,000 for ventilating machinery in the attic of the Senate Chamber.

On amendments numbered 73 and 74: Appropriates \$56,400, instead of \$114,000, as proposed by the Senate, for completing the new Freedman's Hospital building.

On amendment numbered 75: Makes the appropriation for resurvey of Wyoming boundary line immediately available.

On amendments numbered 76, 77, and 81: Appropriates \$100,000, instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, for gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, and limits the investigation of structural materials by the Geological Survey to such as are for the use of the United States, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments numbered 84 and 85: Appropriates \$25,200 to continue the work of reproducing the official records of the offices of the surveyor-general and register and receiver at San Francisco until December 31, 1907, and \$2,000 for rent of office room for said force.

On amendment numbered 86: Makes the appropriation for the Mesa Verde National Park immediately available.

On amendment numbered 88: Strikes out the provision proposed by the Senate placing the control of the expenditure of the appropriation for reindeer in Alaska under the Commissioner of Immigration.

On amendments numbered 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, and 94: Fixes the price per lamp per annum for electric lights in the public parks at \$85, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$80, as proposed by the House.

On amendment numbered 95: Appropriates \$1,500 for road to national cemetery at Keokuk, Iowa.

On amendment numbered 100: Makes the appropriation heretofore made for enlargement of the Fort Sheridan Military Reservation available for additional land.

On amendments numbered 101 and 102: Appropriates \$40,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park.

On amendment numbered 103: Appropriates \$130,629.67, as proposed by the Senate, for Providence Hospital.

On amendment numbered 104: Appropriates \$6,500, as proposed by the Senate, for renewal of plumbing in Garfield Hospital.

On amendment numbered 105: Makes appropriation of \$15,000, heretofore made for moorings in Hampton Roads and adjacent waters available also for temporary beacons and buoys during the Jamestown Exposition.

On amendments numbered 106 and 107: Appropriates \$45,000, as proposed by the Senate, for improving sewerage system at the Soldiers' Home at Togus, Me.

On amendments numbered 108, 109, 110, and 111: Appropriates \$6,500, as proposed by the Senate, for pipe line to water system at the Pacific Branch of the Soldiers' Home, and strikes out the appropriation of \$8,325 proposed by the Senate for an iron fence at said Home.

On amendment numbered 112: Makes the appropriation for the Red Cross conference immediately available.

On amendments numbered 113, 114, and 115: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$1,800 for rent of an additional building for the Department of Justice; \$1,000 for furniture, and \$3,000 for miscellaneous expenses of said Department.

On amendment numbered 116: Appropriates \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, for a court-house and jail at Nome, Alaska.

On amendments numbered 118, 119, 120, and 121: Makes cer-

tain appropriations for the reform school for the District of Columbia immediately available, and makes a verbal correction in the text of the bill.

On amendment numbered 122: Inserts the provision proposed by the Senate relative to printing for The Military Secretary's office, War Department.

On amendments numbered 123 and 124: Appropriates \$2,298,367.50, as proposed by the Senate, to pay outstanding four and one-half per cent bonds of the Panama Railway Company.

On amendment numbered 125: Restores to the bill the provisions proposed by the House making available for equipment purposes the appropriation made for 1907 for reequipment of the Panama Railroad.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the following amendments of the Senate, namely:

On amendment numbered 4, concerning public building at Denver, Colo.

On amendment numbered 10, concerning subtreasury public building at San Francisco.

On amendment numbered 11, addition to Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

On amendment numbered 12, appropriating \$3,000,000 for buildings for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and Labor.

On amendment numbered 22, appropriating \$125,000 for transportation of silver coin.

On amendments numbered 68 and 69, striking out the provision of the House requiring the statistics as to woman and child labor to be taken by the Census Office.

On amendments numbered 78, 79, 80, 82, and 83, relating to the Geological Survey.

On amendment numbered 87, proposing to establish a national park in Idaho.

On amendments numbered 96, 97, 98, and 99, relating to military posts.

On amendment numbered 117, relating to the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission.

On amendment numbered 126, striking out the provision proposed by the House relating to the purchase of supplies for Executive Departments, and inserting, by the Senate, appropriations for purchase of parks in the District of Columbia.

J. A. TAWNEY,

WALTER I. SMITH,

GEO. W. TAYLOR,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to agree to the conference report.

Mr. TAWNEY. On that I ask the previous question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask about the last item read by the Clerk. Is there a disagreement on that?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the item.

The Clerk read as follows:

On amendment numbered 126, striking out the provision proposed by the House relating to the purchase of supplies for Executive Departments, and inserting by the Senate appropriations for purchase of parks in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand there is a disagreement on that?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is disagreed to. The conferees have not agreed to it.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, there are some amendments we understand have been agreed to and some not, but we have not had opportunity to examine the report of the conference committee. To some of the amendments disagreed to we desire to ask the House to recede from its former disagreement and to concur, and I desire to make a motion of that kind at the appropriate time.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will say if the previous question is ordered on the adoption of the report and the report is adopted, I understand the parliamentary situation then will be that any Member of the House who desires a separate vote on any amendment yet in conference and disagreed to will have an opportunity to make that motion. Following the adoption of the report I intend to move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments that are yet in conference and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. KEIFER. But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a motion to recede from some amendments.

The SPEAKER. But the motion can not be made until the conference report is first disposed of.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota shut out a separate vote on any amendment which may be desired?

The SPEAKER. Not of those still undisposed of, but this would buckle all those agreed to—that is, buckle up everything covered by the report.

The question was taken; and the report was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments yet undisposed of and ask for a further conference.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment?

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, before that is put I desire a separate vote—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please state on what amendment a separate vote is desired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to get some information from the chairman of the committee before I make the request. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee to state the situation of this bill at present as to the items in reference to the Geological Survey.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say for the information of the House and for the information of the gentleman from Alabama that the particular items in disagreement between the two Houses in this report are, first, the amendment of the Senate proposing to purchase the site for a departmental building at the cost of \$3,000,000. There is another Senate amendment in respect to a public building that is in disagreement, which is an authorization of the preparation of plans for the construction of a very large public building in the city of Denver. The amendment of the Senate in respect to woman and child labor is in disagreement, and the amendment of the Senate in respect to the fuel tests, increasing the appropriation \$50,000, and the language which extends the purpose of that investigation to all the coal fields of the United States, is in disagreement; and the amendment in respect to the investigation of black sand; also the amendment in respect to the transportation of silver dollars, and the amendment in respect to the purchase of large areas of land in the District of Columbia for public parks is in disagreement. Those are the chief amendments that are in disagreement, including also—and I do not want to omit it—the amendment of the Senate striking out the House provision standardizing the miscellaneous supplies of the Departments, which was carried in our bill as we passed it in the House.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. I would like to know what was done about the structural material for topographical survey?

Mr. TAWNEY. The structural-material item is included in the agreement. The House conferees receded from the disagreement and agreed to the language the Senate inserted. That is the only change.

Mr. DALZELL. Did they cut out the words "for use of?"

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; "for use of."

Mr. DALZELL. That is not a disagreement?

Mr. TAWNEY. No.

Mr. DALZELL. No. 78, increasing the sum to \$50,000, and No. 79, putting in the language that was stricken out on the point of order, are both in disagreement, and also, if I understand the gentleman rightly, No. 80, for the investigation of black sand?

Mr. TAWNEY. Those three are all in disagreement.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. And the one relating to the topographical survey?

Mr. TAWNEY. The topographical survey is in disagreement.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Is there an agreement on the investigation of water resources?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; there is an agreement, and it is included in the report just adopted.

Mr. MONDELL. As I understand it, the agreement is a reduction of \$50,000 in the Senate provision?

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] spoke of matters of serious disagreement, and did not mention the omnibus park bill, to provide four parks in the District of Columbia.

Mr. TAWNEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did mention it.

Mr. SIMS. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I misunderstood it.

Mr. TAWNEY. I stated that the proposition to purchase various areas in the District of Columbia for public parks is in serious disagreement.



Mr. SIMS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say "seriously in disagreement."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that this colloquy is interesting to the gentlemen, but the rest of us would like to know what it is.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have made the motion that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment?

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, there is.

The SPEAKER. What amendment?

Mr. KEIFER. On amendment No. 22.

The SPEAKER. Any other amendment?

Mr. KEIFER. Yes; there are others here. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] will designate the numbers.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask a separate vote?

Mr. DALZELL. On amendments Nos. 78, 79, and 80.

Mr. KEIFER. And on No. 76 also.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on Senate amendment No. 82.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask a separate vote upon the provision relating to the investigation of woman and child labor.

The SPEAKER. What is the number of it?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not have the number.

Mr. PARSONS. Nos. 68 and 69.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? If not, the vote will be taken on the remaining amendments in gross. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] moves to further insist on the House disagreement to the Senate amendment, excepting those on which separate votes have been demanded.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22, to strike out the paragraph reading as follows: "Transportation of fractional silver coin: For transportation of fractional silver coin, by registered mail or otherwise, \$50,000; and in expending this sum the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transport from the Treasury or subtreasuries, free of charge, fractional silver coin when requested to do so: *Provided*, That an equal amount in coin or currency shall have been deposited in the Treasury or such subtreasuries by the applicant or applicants. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress the cost arising under this appropriation."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

Transportation of silver coin: For transportation of silver coin, including fractional silver coin by registered mail or otherwise, \$125,000; and in expending this sum the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transport from the Treasury or subtreasuries, free of charge, silver coin when requested to do so: *Provided*, That an equal amount in coin or currency shall have been deposited in the Treasury or such subtreasuries by the applicant or applicants. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress the cost arising under this appropriation.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and agree to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the same. The gentleman from Minnesota controls the time.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEIFER. Ten minutes will be more than I will want.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to rehash the talk that has been going on during this and the last session on the subject of the free carriage by the Government of silver coin. Originally when this bill came in here it made no provision for carrying any silver coin, neither silver dollars nor fractional silver. The bill was amended in the House so as to appropriate \$50,000 for the carriage of fractional silver coin. It was my proposition that we should appropriate \$120,000, the usual sum appropriated in recent years for the purpose of carrying silver coin generally. The Senate put in this amendment, which I now move to have concurred in, appropriating \$125,000 for the free carriage by the Government of silver coin—that is, the carriage of silver dollars and fractional silver coin. This is the exact amount that the Secretary of the Treasury asked this year to have appropriated.

In the general deficiency bill that we passed last night we put in a sufficient sum to carry silver dollars and fractional coin for the remainder of the present fiscal year.

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not think the gentleman is stating that exactly right. We carry a deficiency for the fiscal year 1906 of six thousand and some odd dollars, which deficiency arose in consequence of the express companies not getting their accounts in in time to be closed up under the appropriation.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, my statement was substantially

right—providing for a deficiency for the carriage of silver coin of all kinds for the present fiscal year. So that up to the end of this present fiscal year provision has been made in accordance with the appropriations ever since 1881.

Now, my motion is to do just that thing that we have been in the habit of doing, to wit, provide for the free carriage by the Government, not to banks alone, but to all persons in this country who may ask to have silver dollars and fractional silver coin sent to them for use. If we do not do this we are striking the first great blow at silver dollars, of which we have about 560,000,000. We are discrediting them. We will be taking out of circulation about 85,000,000 silver dollars and will have to substitute small paper at greater expense than is proposed by this amendment. The silver dollar is desired by the miner in the coal-mining regions and in all places where oil is being pumped from the earth and handled. It is desired by all miners in the mining regions of the United States, including Alaska, and by the common people throughout the entire West. It is desired by all of the people of the South where labor is carried on. The people use the silver dollar and like it. The opposition seems to come from places where they do not desire it, or perhaps need it; from places like the city of New York, where the people and the banks can get their silver coin without any expense to the party or to the Government, and this is true in other eastern cities. Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington are all places where there are subtreasuries or a treasury of the United States, where silver coin can be obtained by the banks when they want it without cost. These cities have five of the ten subtreasuries of the United States. The other five are at New Orleans, Chicago, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and San Francisco. Now, when you go west of St. Louis there is but one place where there is a subtreasury where silver coins can be obtained, and that is San Francisco; and all that great geographical region west, if they want silver, the people who use it, will have to obtain it at great cost to themselves, whereas the people who are opposing this, from the East, can obtain it without any cost. And, as said by Mr. Roberts, the Director of the Mint, it is essential and necessary in order to keep up our circulation of currency and coin in the United States.

I appeal to the House to do simply that thing which has been done and accepted as proper by the people practically since we had silver coin to a large amount to circulate in this country. It is not, as has been stated on the floor of this House over and over, in order to defeat this provision, an appropriation of \$125,000 or \$135,000 to carry silver dollars alone; but all that is asked here is an additional appropriation of \$75,000; and it will turn out that if this is not done that we will have to provide for a deficiency yet for carrying fractional silver.

In the past fractional silver coin and silver dollars have been carried together, and it has been hard to separate the cost of each separately. The cost is not to be measured by the amount so much as by the cost and the frequency of shipment. There was a little incident that occurred a few years ago called the "Yonkers incident," in which gentlemen say the Government was cheated out of a few dollars in the matter of transporting coin, and that has been the stock in trade of those who are opposed to carrying more silver coin for a great many years. It has been repeated in this session of this Congress, but that incident is of the past and was corrected; and we have been carrying millions upon millions of dollars since without a second incident, so far as I know. The Government should look to it that it makes no contracts by which it will be cheated in the carriage of this money. I wonder they do not urge it now against having any appropriation at all for carrying currency or coin, because by some possibility somebody may do something that is not fair to the Government. I regard this as of great importance to the country, especially to the great Northwest and the South, and to all the people who desire to continue to use the silver. We should not discredit and drive out of use the, about, \$85,000,000 now generally in circulation, and which we have by law pledged to keep on a parity with gold.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I desire to submit at this time. There are others who want to be heard on this question.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This provision which the Senate has enacted, or substantially this provision, has been in every appropriation bill for more than twenty-five years. It has for its purpose the sending to distant places in the country of silver dollars, which are very much desired and needed there, and it does help to keep in circulation the silver dollars, of which we have so large an amount coined and piled up in the United States Treasury. That there is now a crying

need in many parts of the country for small bills or silver dollars is evidenced by the provisions of the Aldrich bill, which has just passed the Senate and which, among other things, attempts to relieve that want. I can see no good reason why we should not appropriate for the carriage of these silver dollars, if we appropriate for carrying fractional currency. The same rule, in my judgment, applies to both, and the demand of the people is as urgent for one as the other. Take it in a far-off lumbering country—I mean a locality distant from any financial center, like that in northern Maine, which in part is located in the district that I have the honor to represent—and the people there, the woodsmen, the laborers, the small banks, and others engaged in business, desire to have these dollars, and very many of them are used. They have been carried to them in the past when called for at a very small expense on the part of the Government. It is common knowledge that the Government has a contract with the express companies for transporting money to all parts of the United States, and under this contract moneys are carried much more cheaply than individuals are charged. These silver dollars are not only wanted by the country banks, but they are used by the people in their business relations. Anybody who looks over our country to-day who is conversant with the conditions in the South and in the West, or even away down in the State of Maine, knows that there is a dearth of small bills; knows that silver dollars are demanded with as much force as is the fractional currency, for the transportation of which this bill provides; and if it is good legislation to appropriate to carry the one, I see no reason why it is not proper and good legislation to appropriate to transport the other when the business of sections distant from a subtreasury demand it.

Of course gentlemen who live in large business and financial centers, who represent banks and banking institutions where there are subtreasuries, or where they are in close contact with subtreasuries, can readily and easily get small currency, can readily and easily get silver dollars; but as to the people who, living far away in small towns and cities, have had the privilege for more than a quarter of a century of obtaining this silver, which has been so beneficial to them and has cost the Government so little compared with its profits from the seigniorage, to take that privilege away will work a great hardship. It seems to me that this is a sort of cheeseparing, a sort of saving that ought not to commend itself to the Members of this House. Therefore I hope that we shall recede and concur. Let the same privileges and opportunity to obtain silver dollars which have been extended to the distant parts of the country and to the country banks for the accommodation of the customers and to the merchants and business men of having these silver dollars carried to them, so that the people can get them when desired and needed, still continue to be granted in the future. [Applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the House for two or three minutes? I am an officer of a bank, and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS] is an officer of a bank. He asks that in the interests of the banks this \$125,000 may be appropriated.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman pardon me?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The gentleman said in the interest of the banks and the people.

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Very well. Now, as an officer of the bank, desiring fair play toward the American people, I ask that the Appropriations Committee may be sustained and this amendment may be defeated. The banks of the United States are paid by this Government about \$5,000,000 a year to furnish circulation to the people of the country, about 1 per cent profit on all of their circulation, and they have no right to come to the United States Treasury and ask that the people as a whole shall transport their money for them from the Treasury. I think that is a sound proposition, and as a bank officer I repudiate coming to the Treasury and asking for charity or help to transport that money. I repudiate it also because I believe it has developed into a colossal system of graft by the express companies. I deny the statement that the Treasury Department is here asking for this money. Not a report has been made to that effect.

Mr. KEIFER. No report has ever been made that I can remember asking to discontinue it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The gentleman remembers what occurred forty years ago, but not what occurs from day to day now.

Mr. KEIFER. The gentleman from Connecticut is mistaken; I will put my memory against his.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I challenge the gentleman.

Mr. KEIFER. It is time for the gentleman from Connecticut to correct his statement, when he says that this is in the interest of the banks alone, when the very terms of it allows any individual to call for the silver coin.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I can not allow the gentleman to make a speech in my time. There has not been a report of the Treasury Department for the last ten years which has not opposed or which has favored the free transportation of silver. Of course, when they submit estimates to pay the expenses of the Government they must make an estimate to carry out the legislation of Congress, if Congress sees fit to legislate contrary to their advice.

Now, I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, and I will rest this proposition on this one statement: An attempt has been made to distinguish between the East and the West and the North and the South. Every one of you gentlemen in the South and in the North and in the East and the West who have found difficulty in getting one and two dollar bills, who have been refused them over and over again at your bank, think that you can not get paper money and must take silver dollars. You have been deceived in that proposition in just this respect—that your banks could get silver dollars free of charge, and they had to pay to get the paper money. Now, that is all there is to it, and if you will disagree to this amendment and compel your banks to get you paper money, you will have no trouble to get all the small bills you want. Why? Here is a proposition that you are probably going to act on to-day, which provides for all the small bills the country can possibly need; all you can ask for, all you can wish are provided for in this bill. I refer to the Aldrich bill. But just so long as the banks can have silver dollars transported to them free that bill will do you no good, for the banks will not pay 60 or 70 cents on each thousand dollars express charges, if they can make the Government pay \$2.15 a thousand on silver, and thus permit them to escape that expense. If you want small bills, if you want paper money, vote down this amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House, in the consideration of this question, felt that in view of the action of the House, it was our duty to insist upon the disagreement of the House to this Senate amendment. Now, what is this proposition? The Senate proposes to give or to appropriate for the transportation of silver dollars more money by this amendment than has ever been appropriated for the purpose in any previous fiscal year. They propose to appropriate \$125,000 for this purpose. The beneficiaries of that appropriation are the banks and the express companies. The Government of the United States and the people of the United States are not benefited when they can get small bills with which to transact their business; it is not material to them. But if the banks can have this smaller currency transported at the expense of the Government while their bills must be transported at their own expense, they will continue, when there is a special demand for currency, to call upon the express companies or to make a demand upon the subtreasury to continue its transportation at the expense of the Government alone for their convenience.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we can justify the expenditure of this large sum of money for the purpose that does not inure to the benefit of the people—one that does not involve the performance of any governmental purpose whatever.

It is, to say the utmost, merely to provide for the convenience of the banks, and, as the gentleman from Connecticut has said, to continue a monumental graft that is now being practiced by the express companies on the Treasury of the United States. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] says that we appropriated in the deficiency bill to continue this practice throughout the remainder of this fiscal year. That statement is not correct.

The appropriation carried in the general deficiency bill was not an anticipated deficiency; it is an actual deficiency. The gentleman also spoke of our paying the expense of transporting currency. It may be that he did not stop to think of the fact, but it is a fact nevertheless, that the Government of the United States does not transport free of charge any money for anybody, except silver dollars and fractional silver coin and minor coin. We have amply provided in the amendment which was offered by the committee, and agreed to by the House, for the transportation of fractional silver currency and also for the transportation of minor coin. That transportation the Government of the United States can afford to pay, because it is making a large profit out of the coinage of fractional silver currency and also out of the minor coins—nickels and pennies. But, Mr. Speaker, I do contend that there is no justification for the Government of the United States paying \$2.50 for every thousand dollars of silver that any bank wants to have transported to the subtreasury or to itself, and I trust that



this motion will be voted down. I believe that if it is voted down we will finally end the practice of transporting free of charge or at the expense of the Government the silver dollars for the benefit of the banks and the large department stores of this country that are using silver dollars as change and as a medium of advertising.

Mr. KEIFER rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Ohio). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] in having made one speech in which he has not exaggerated the cost of carrying the silver dollars by the Government. A few days ago he had it one hundred and thirty-five thousand, and to-day he is modest about it. He still insists that it is the banks that get the benefit of it, whereas it is the people and not the banks that get the benefit of it, and both the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] say that we do not carry any coin. I beg their pardon, but I desire to say that we carry all of the coin to different parts of the United States—gold, as well as silver—for the purposes of distribution. We do not carry gold coin in exactly the same way, but we send gold coin and paper money all over the country, to all the subtreasuries or business centers of the United States. If we did not do that we would all have to go to the mints for all our coin, and to Washington, D. C., for our paper currency, and then suffer the inconvenience and great injustice that the gentlemen who oppose this Senate amendment desire the people who believe in the silver dollar and who want to use it will suffer if this amendment is not adopted. I congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] on again calling attention to the single Yonkers incident, about the irregularity of an express company in carrying coin, where the Government was cheated, and insisting that that one instance should be a sufficient reason for striking down a policy of the Government that has existed so long and worked so well. The gentleman says I was mistaken about my statement as to the general deficiency bill. I was exactly right. Reading the bill will show that I was. The language of it shows that we did appropriate, to add to the one hundred and twenty thousand that we appropriated last year, about \$18,000 more, to complete the carriage of silver dollars and fractional coins for the present fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 22, and agree to the same.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced himself in doubt.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAWNEY. The question that the House is about to vote upon is upon agreeing to the Senate amendment appropriating \$125,000 for the transportation of silver dollars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the question. The question is, Shall the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 22, and concur.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 107, nays 151, answered "present" 8, not voting 111, as follows:

## YEAS—107.

Adamson	Dixon, Ind.	Laub	Sheppard
Alken	Dixon, Mont.	Lee	Sibley
Bankhead	Ellerbe	Legare	Sims
Bartlett	Finley	Lever	Slayden
Beall, Tex.	Flood	Lewis	Small
Bell, Ga.	French	Lloyd	Smith, Ky.
Bonyne	Gaines, Tenn.	Macon	Smith, Md.
Brantley	Garber	Maynard	Smith, Tex.
Brooks, Colo.	Garrett	Meyer	Snyder
Broussard	Gill	Mondell	Southall
Brumm	Gillespie	Moon, Tenn.	Sparkman
Brundidge	Graham	Mouser	Spight
Burgess	Granger	Norris	Stephens, Tex.
Burleson	Gregg	Overstreet, Ga.	Sulzer
Burnett	Gronna	Padgett	Thomas, N. C.
Calderhead	Haskins	Page	Thomas, Ohio
Candler	Hay	Patterson, S. C.	Towne
Chaney	Heffin	Powers	Trimble
Clark, Fla.	Hill, Miss.	Pujo	Underwood
Clark, Mo.	Houston	Rainey	Wallace
Clayton	Howard	Randell, Tex.	Wanger
Cole	Hunt	Ransdell, La.	Watkins
Davey, La.	James	Richardson, Ala.	Webb
Davis, W. Va.	Keifer	Robinson, Ark.	Wiley, Ala.
Dawes	Kinkaid	Rucker	Williams
De Armond	Kitchin, Claude	Russell	Zenor
Deemer	Lamar	Shackelford	

## NAYS—151.

Acheson	Edwards	Kline	Reynolds
Alexander	Ellis	Knapp	Riordan
Allen, Me.	Englebright	Knopf	Roberts
Babcock	Esch	Knowland	Rodenberg
Bannon	Fassett	Lacey	Ruppert
Bates	Fitzgerald	Lafean	Ryan
Bede	Fletcher	Law	Samuel
Bennet, N. Y.	Fordney	Lawrence	Schneebeli
Brick	Foss	Lilley, Conn.	Scott
Brown	Fowler	Longworth	Sherley
Brownlow	Fulkerson	Loud	Sherman
Burke, S. Dak.	Gaines, W. Va.	Loudenslager	Smith, Ill.
Burton, Del.	Gardner, Mass.	Lovering	Smith, Iowa
Burton, Ohio	Gardner, Mich.	Lowden	Smith, Mich.
Calder	Gillett	McCall	Smith, Pa.
Campbell, Kans.	Glass	McCleary, Minn.	Southard
Capron	Goebel	McGavin, Pa.	Sperry
Cassel	Graft	McGavin	Stafford
Chapman	Greene	McKinney	Sterling
Cocks	Grosvenor	McMorran	Stevens, Minn.
Cooper, Pa.	Gudger	Mahon	Sullivan
Cooper, Wis.	Hale	Mann	Sulloway
Coudry	Hamilton	Martin	Tawney
Crumpacker	Hedge	Minor	Taylor, Ala.
Currer	Henry, Conn.	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ohio
Cushman	Heppburn	Mudd	Tirrell
Dale	Higgins	Needham	Townsend
Dalzell	Hill, Conn.	Nelson	Volstead
Darragh	Hinsaw	Olcott	Wachter
Davidson	Holliday	Olmsted	Wadsworth
Davis, Minn.	Howell, N. J.	Otjen	Waldo
Dawson	Hubbard	Parsons	Washburn
Denby	Humphrey, Wash.	Payne	Weeks
Dickson, Ill.	Jenkins	Pearre	Wharton
Dovener	Jones, Wash.	Perkins	Wiley, N. J.
Draper	Kellher	Pollard	Wood
Driscoll	Kennedy, Nebr.	Prince	Woodyard
Dunwell	Kennedy, Ohio	Reeder	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Butler, Pa.	Foster, Vt.	Hull	Livingston
Cousins	Goulden	Lilley, Pa.	Lorimer

## NOT VOTING—111.

Allen, N. J.	Field	Landis, Frederick	Reyburn
Ames	Floyd	Le Fevre	Rhinock
Andrus	Foster, Ind.	Lindsay	Rhodes
Barchfeld	Fuller	Littauer	Richardson, Ky.
Bartholdt	Gardner, N. J.	Littlefield	Rives
Beidler	Garner	McCarthy	Robertson, La.
Bennett, Ky.	Gilbert	McDermott	Saunders
Bingham	Gilham	McKinlay, Cal.	Scroggy
Birdsall	Goldfogle	McKinley, Ill.	Shartel
Bishop	Griggs	McLachlan	Slemp
Blackburn	Hardwick	McLain	Smith, Cal.
Boutell	Haugen	McNary	Snapp
Bowers	Hayes	Madden	Southwick
Bowersock	Hearst	Marshall	Stanley
Bowie	Henry, Tex.	Marshall	Steenerson
Bradley	Hermann	Miller	Talbott
Broocks, Tex.	Hogg	Moore, Pa.	Tyndall
Buckman	Hopkins	Moore, Tex.	Van Duzer
Burke, Pa.	Howell, Utah	Morrell	Van Winkle
Burleigh	Huff	Murdoch	Vreeland
Butler, Tenn.	Hughes	Murphy	Watson
Byrd	Humphreys, Miss.	Nevin	Webber
Campbell, Ohio	Johnson	Overstreet, Ind.	Weems
Cockran	Jones, Va.	Palmer	Weisse
Conner	Kahn	Parker	Welborn
Cromer	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Patterson, N. C.	Wilson
Dresser	Klepper	Pou	Young
Dwight	Landis, Chas. B.	Reid	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the day:

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. RIVES with Mr. VAN DUZER.

Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. BARCHFELD with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

Mr. BIRDSALL with Mr. McNARY.

Mr. McKINLAY of California with Mr. BYRD.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee.

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. MOORE of Texas.

Mr. CONNER with Mr. FIELD.

Mr. HAYES with Mr. McLAIN.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. RHINOCK.

Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. MARSHALL with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. MILLER with Mr. JONES of Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. HEARST.

Mr. WILSON with Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky.

For the vote:

Mr. COUSINS with Mr. REID.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. SMITH of California with Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina.

Until further notice:

Mr. DWIGHT with Mr. FLOYD.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania with Mr. GARNER.

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.  
 Mr. HUGHES with Mr. STANLEY.  
 Mr. LORIMER with Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi.  
 Mr. MADDEN with Mr. HARDWICK.  
 Mr. YOUNG with Mr. WEISSE.  
 Mr. FULLER with Mr. HOPKINS.  
 Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania with Mr. GILBERT.  
 Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. COCKRAN.  
 Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POW.  
 Mr. AMES with Mr. BOWIE.  
 Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

For the session:

Mr. VAN WINKLE with Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 Mr. MCCARTHY with Mr. BROOKS of Texas.  
 Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

The result was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is recognized.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreeing vote to this amendment and ask for a further conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House further insist upon disagreement to the Senate amendment and ask for further conference.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The next amendment is amendment No. 68. No. 69 is so closely connected with it, if there is no objection, it may be considered with it. Is there objection to the consideration of the two amendments together?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They ought to be considered together. They are substantially one amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request is made that amendments Nos. 68 and 69, which are inseparably connected, may be considered together. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the amendments reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 68:  
 Page 101, in line 5, strike out "Census Office."  
 Amendment No. 69:  
 Page 101, lines 5 and 6, strike out "under the Census Office."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, if I can have order, I think I can state what the amendment is in a word. When the sundry civil bill was under consideration an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] to place the investigation as to women and child workers under the Bureau of Labor. The bill as reported provided for investigations under the Census Office. Now, the Senate has stricken out the Census Office, leaving the investigation to be made under the Department of Commerce and Labor. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question before the House is, Is there objection to the consideration of the two amendments together? If there is no objection, they will be considered together.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota can proceed only by unanimous consent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent, then, to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] may explain these two amendments.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand I have the floor on this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will suggest that no motion has been made to recede and concur, and the Chair would further suggest that the request has been made that these two amendments be considered together. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I had supposed they had been submitted.

Mr. Speaker, I move now that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and that the House concur in those amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 68 and 69 and concur in the same.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Senate amendment is to leave the investigation of women and children in the industries under the control of the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor instead of requiring that investigation to be made by the Census Office. This question was up when the sundry civil bill was before the House for consideration. The law originally authorizing the investigation required it to be done by the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor. It authorized him, of course, as he would have had the power without specific authority, to use any bureau in his Department in making the investigation. The Director of the Census informed the Committee on Appropriations that the Census Office was not fitted or adapted to make this kind of investigations. The Census Office recently published a very excellent report upon children in the industries. It is now engaged in the preparation of a report upon women in the industries. These reports are largely statistical, the only kind of reports the Census Office is qualified to make. The Census Office is peculiarly a census office, a statistical bureau, and this investigation, as, of course, the House knows, is much broader than merely a statistical investigation. It goes into the sociological, the moral, and the educational condition of women and children in the industries. And it seems to me that if the investigation is to be made at all, it ought to be made by the Bureau of Labor. The question ought to be left with the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and rather than to require the Census Office to make the investigation the appropriation had better be struck out altogether, because in a large measure it must of necessity be a duplication of work that has recently been done, and the result will not be satisfying to those who are promoting the investigation.

It is one of great importance and ought to be in the hands of a bureau that is peculiarly fitted to make this identical kind of investigation. The Administration earnestly asks that the Labor Bureau be charged with this work and responsibility. But the amendment put in the bill by the Senate leaves the whole question to the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor; leaves it where the original law vested it; leaves it where it ought to be left. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the House ought to recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment. If it can not do that, I believe the appropriation ought to be stricken from the bill; because I believe it will be largely a waste of money. I have the utmost faith in the Census Office. It is a splendid statistical bureau, and its reputation is such that the Government ought to be proud of its work. But statistical work ought not to be commingled and combined with this speculative investigation contemplated by the appropriation carried in the bill. The Census Bureau ought to be free from speculative inquiries. The reports of that office should be impartial, free from opinion, free from bias, color, or recommendation, if its reputation and work are to be valuable for statistical purposes.

Mr. KEFFER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman whether the Census Office has ever had an investigation of this character, and whether it is not confined to matters of statistics?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Its work has always been confined to statistical investigations, and the labor office has conducted all the labor investigations that the Government has ever authorized; and, incidentally, valuable reports have been made and given to the public on such questions by the Bureau of Labor.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will now answer the question that the gentleman from Missouri wanted to ask.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I want to know is this, so that Members can understand how they are voting: There is so much confusion you can not hear anything. Now, if we vote for the Crumpacker motion and it carries, then this work is to be done by the Labor Bureau?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will answer the gentleman's question. It will then be done by the Department of Commerce and Labor, and under the law the Department of Commerce and Labor is authorized to utilize the Bureau of Labor or the Census Bureau; and then, in addition to that, the law is so loosely drawn that it is construed to give the Secretary authority to employ agencies other than those two Bureaus for the purpose of making this investigation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then if we vote down the Crumpacker motion, then we go back to your position and say that it shall be done by the Census Office?

Mr. TAWNEY. Not necessarily. We ask the House to further insist on disagreeing to the Senate amendment. Then it would go back to conference again, and the House would not



lose an opportunity to vote on the proposition later on as they may see fit to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, one more question. If the Crumpacker motion prevails, then the Secretary can have it done by either one of the two Bureaus?

Mr. TAWNEY. Then he will be able to have it done by either one of the two Bureaus or any outside agency he may see fit to employ.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And if your motion prevails, it will have to be done by the Census Bureau?

Mr. TAWNEY. It will have to be done by the Census Bureau, provided the Senate recedes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the Senate amendment prevails, then it would open up the possibility of having it done at an additional cost, possibly the creation of an additional bureau, demanding an additional appropriation; and that would not be necessary if it was done by the Census Bureau?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is exactly what it means.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Then I am with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TAWNEY. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the question before us is very simple. If the motion of the gentleman from Indiana prevails, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor is given discretion to have the condition of woman and child labor investigated as he sees fit. If the motion is voted down, the amendment goes back into conference. The House, when the bill was before it, voted to place this work on the Census Office. It did that because the committee, after a complete investigation, determined that the Census Office was the only bureau of the Department of Commerce and Labor that was equipped to do the work.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did not the Director of the Census state that his office was not equipped to do this work, and that he did not want to do it, and did not want it loaded onto him?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will reply to that in my own way. The Director of the Census in effect stated this: That his Bureau had been compiling facts and publishing information that was accurate; that the public had confidence in the reports of his Bureau; that the information sought to be acquired by this investigation was of such an uncertain character that he feared if his office was charged with the obligation of doing the work, that it would seriously impair the confidence of the public in the reports made by his Bureau in other investigations.

It is easy to understand his statement that he did not desire to do the work, because the President has stated that he did not want the Census Bureau to do it. The Secretary of Commerce and Labor has stated that he did not want him to do it. The Commissioner of Labor insists that his Bureau is the proper bureau to do the work. The question for the House to determine, with all the information before it, is which bureau will most efficiently and economically do the work. I merely wish to say one word with regard to a certain statement that has been issued as to the motive that is behind the effort to compel the Census Bureau to do the work. It is not a reflection on the Bureau of Labor; it is not intended, as has been charged, as a penalty upon the Bureau for doing certain other work, but the action of the committee was based upon the conviction, which was made certain by all the evidence before it, that the only bureau of the Government that has the facilities to do the work is the Census Bureau.

The Commissioner of Labor himself admits that he had not the facilities to do this work, and that if he is charged with it he will have to spend months in the most important cities of the country in perfecting an organization. I believe the preliminary work of organizing his bureau will take as long as it would take the Census Bureau to complete the investigation. Nobody has charged that the Census Bureau has been inefficient in other work heretofore imposed upon it. Nobody has complained that it has been partial in its investigations. It has so done the work committed to it that it has earned the confidence of the entire country, and for one I am heartily in favor of imposing this investigation upon that bureau, because I believe it will do the work better than any other bureau.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] three minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not really know whether this squabble is very important or not, but one thing I

do know, and that is that child labor in factories ought to cease. It has dwarfed the English laboring people to such an alarming extent that a systematic governmental inquiry has been instituted to discover some remedy for the physical decadence of English men and women. Child labor in factories will dwarf our laboring people. We should put a stop to it before it is everlastingly too late; and surely we should have the facts. I do not care very much what the President of the United States wants, or the Secretary of Commerce and Labor or the Director of the Census. It seems to me, however, expressing my own opinion and not undertaking to express the opinion of anybody else, that it is the difference between putting this investigation into friendly hands and unfriendly hands; and on that proposition the President and his Secretary of Commerce and Labor happen to be right.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Does the gentleman suspect the Census Bureau of being unfriendly?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly what I do, under the circumstances.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Have you any reason for suspecting the Bureau of the Census to be unfriendly?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do, because it did not want to do the work. It is but human nature that if you or I or any of the rest of us are set to do a task that we really want to do, we will do it with a great deal more enthusiasm and thoroughness than if we are set to do another task that we do not want to do. The Director of the Census says they are not situated to do it. He ought to know. These other people do want to do it, and I am in favor of giving them a chance. None of them can do anything except collect the facts, and facts are what we want. Nobody cares anything about what the opinion of some one is. What we want is the facts. These facts properly presented will give the various State legislatures information on which to act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman from Missouri think he ought to vote to put this work in charge of a bureau the head of which admits that he has neither the organization nor the facilities to do the work?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will answer that question in this way: While he says that, the Director of the Census says he is not fixed to do it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He did not say exactly that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If he did not say that, I should like to know very much what he did say.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. He said that the organization of his office was not adapted to doing it. He said he did not know anything about that kind of an investigation himself and he could not prepare for it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly the situation. I do not mean that the Census Bureau is unfriendly to finding out the truth about it, but I do say that the Census Bureau in this particular juncture is unfriendly to this investigation. It does not want to undertake the work, and the work should not be forced upon it. That is all I have to say about it.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the House has any reason to apprehend that the Director of the Census will not perform his duty if the law imposes upon him the obligation of doing this work. It is true it is a new work for him. It is equally true that it would be a new kind of work for the Bureau of Labor. It is also true that the Census Office has compiled statistics heretofore and is better equipped than the Bureau of Labor for doing that kind of work. There is no reason why the Bureau of the Census can not do the work better than the Bureau of Labor, because it is an older organization and a better-equipped one. Although the Director of the Census did say it was new work, which he would not like to undertake and that his Bureau was not adapted for the doing of it, his statement did not carry conviction before the committee, for he gave the committee no reasons for that conclusion, and the committee believed that not only was his Bureau adapted for it, but that it was better adapted for it than any other agency of the Government.

Now, the House can choose, if it will, to create a new organization at a greater expense to the taxpayers or have the work performed cheaper by an organization already in existence. The House the other day voted by a large majority to put this work under the Director of the Census. Since that vote was taken no new reason has grown up why we should reject the previous conclusion, except the insistence of the executive department of the Government that the law shall

be bent according to its will, and that, I submit, is not a sufficient reason to cause this House to reverse its previously recorded judgment. [Applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

Mr. KEIFER. I will be corrected if I am not right in this, that the census is now under the direction of the Department of Commerce and Labor. That being conceded, what we are proposing to do is to direct the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, through the Census Bureau, one of the bureaus under that Secretary, to make this investigation. Now, I think the bill as it comes to us amended from the Senate is exactly right, and if I am right in my statement—and no one seems to controvert it—then if we agree to the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to recede from our disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment, it will leave the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to make this investigation according to his own best plan, and he might even do it under the Census Bureau.

We are undertaking to tell him how he is to carry out the provisions of the act of January 29, 1907, a provision that requires an investigation into the condition of women and child workers in the United States, one of the most important laws perhaps that this or any other Congress has ever passed, important in its ultimate results on the condition of humanity in the United States. I therefore insist that to adopt the motion of the gentleman from Indiana is simply to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to build up whatever machinery is necessary under him to carry out this required investigation.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word in conclusion in regard to this amendment. When this amendment was offered on the floor of the House last week in the Committee of the Whole it was voted down by a vote of 98 to 34. The conferees on the part of the House therefore felt that it was their duty to return to the House and report a disagreement instead of agreeing, even had we been disposed to agree, to the Senate amendments.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Is it not true when this amendment was proposed, when this bill was before the Committee of the Whole House, that it was not the present amendment, but one to strike out the Census Office and substitute the Bureau of Labor; and this simply strikes out the Census Office and leaves it with the Department of Commerce and Labor?

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman has stated the facts correctly; but it is only fair to say that while the amendment comes back from the Senate to the House in the form it does it is not, in substance, different from the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. In fact, it is in effect the same amendment. Every person, every Member of this House, knows that those who are opposed to this investigation being made by the Census Bureau intend and propose to have it made by the Bureau of Labor. Now, as the gentleman from Ohio has said, this investigation under the law is placed in the Department of Commerce and Labor. The law does not stop there; the law simply declares that the head of the Department may utilize the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor. The law also contains other language which is construed to confer upon that Department authority to employ any independent agency to make that investigation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the thought of the House undoubtedly was, as expressed in the vote a few nights ago, that inasmuch as the Census Bureau now has an organization of intelligent special agents, clerks, and other people eminently qualified to make the investigation, and in view of the fact that the Bureau of Labor has no organization at all and will necessarily have to create a new organization for the purpose of carrying on this investigation, to place the investigation under that Bureau would lead to an enormous unnecessary expense. For this reason, sir, it was thought best to leave this investigation under the Census Bureau, as the Committee on Appropriations recommended.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to ask the gentleman if this is not the difference in that proposition—that if it is left to the Census it will be a mere statement of facts; if it is left to the Bureau of Labor, it will be an investigation that will wake the country up to legislation to protect women and children. Is not that the real difference?

Mr. TAWNEY. Why, I am surprised at the want of information manifested by the gentleman from Alabama in the question that he has asked.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Wherein is the want of information?

Mr. TAWNEY. The want of information is as to what the law requires this investigation to be. The law specifies the character of the investigation. It can not be determined by the character of the work now being done by that Bureau, and it is only a question of which agency of the Government shall be employed for the purpose of finding that information. It does not necessarily mean statistical information alone if you confine it to the Census Bureau. The men employed in the Census Bureau who are engaged in gathering statistics in regard to manufacturing industries are sufficiently intelligent to acquire information regarding the manufacturing industries of the country; and what sense is there, what justification is there, for Congress to require that when a man goes into a factory one day to gather information which he is authorized to obtain that he shall then cease that investigation, leave the factory, and then be followed by another man from another bureau in the same Department the next day to obtain the information which is required under this law?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Because the gentleman well knows it is discretionary with the agent to make the kind of a report that he expects to make. The Census Bureau will report statistics, and if you leave it to the Bureau of Labor it will report facts. It will show where these women and children are being ground down, and the Census report will not show that. That is why this investigation ought to be made by the bureau that will show the country what is actually happening.

Mr. TAWNEY. I am surprised that the gentleman from Alabama is unable to comprehend the duty the law imposes upon the bureau that is charged with making this investigation, I care not whether it is the Census Bureau or the Bureau of Labor.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that in the past and at the present time the Census Bureau in making various reports makes reports covering the whole scope of the subject, without confining itself to statistical information alone?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is absolutely the fact, and the last two bulletins published by the Census Bureau disclose that fact.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that in such matters as reports upon chemicals, those reports cover the whole scope of the subject, a thorough report not upon statistics, but upon the subject-matter, and that these reports are considered the standard reports in the United States covering the whole scope of the subject?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is absolutely true.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a question.

Mr. KEIFER. I wish to ask the gentleman, in order that the House may know, whether there is anything in the act of January 29, 1907, that requires a statistical report at all, and whether it is not confined wholly to the matter of conditions—that is, relating to the industrial, social, moral, educational, and physical condition of women and children workers—and whether he can find anything in that act that relates to any matter that is statistical, as is usual in the matter of the Census Bureau?

Mr. TAWNEY. In respect to the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER], I will say that it is just as competent for the representatives of the Census Bureau to inquire into the things mentioned in that law as it is for the representatives of the Bureau of Labor or any outside organization that may be brought in for the purpose of making its investigation.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do.

Mr. PRINCE. Is it not a fact that the same Cabinet officer directs this investigation, whether it is through the census or through the other bureau?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is true.

Mr. PRINCE. And if there is any question about going into the merits of it, it falls upon the Cabinet officer, and no one else, in failing to make the report.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is a fact.

Mr. MANN. If this work should be done by the Census Office, is it the intention, as insinuated by the gentleman on the opposition, to have the work done by the tabulating machines in the Census Office?

Mr. TAWNEY. I don't think I need to answer that question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I call for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion



of the gentleman from Indiana, that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 68 and 69 and concur in the same.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRUMPACKER) there were—ayes 55, noes 87.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. TAWNEY. I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to amendments numbered 68 and 69.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The next amendment to which there is disagreement is numbered 76, which the Clerk will read.

Mr. KEIFER. I called attention to that for a separate vote, and somebody said the matter had been adjusted.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is included in the report which has been adopted.

Mr. KEIFER. Then it is already adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Seventy-eight is the next Senate amendment, and the Clerk will report the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 10, insert, after the word "hundred," the words "and fifty," so as to read: "\$250,000."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 78 and agree to the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would suggest the amendment now under consideration is numbered 77.

Mr. TAWNEY. No. 77 is embodied in the report which has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was in error. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House recede from its disagreement numbered 78 and concur in the same. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the paragraph to which the amendment is made is that—

For the continuation of the analyzing and testing of the coals, lignites, and other mineral fuel substances belonging to the United States, in order to determine their fuel value, etc., under the supervision of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, \$200,000.

The Senate has amended by adding "and fifty," making the total appropriation \$250,000. The appropriation for the current year in the sundry civil bill is \$250,000. The amendment offered in the House was for \$250,000, but \$50,000 was stricken out upon the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota upon the statement that a considerable amount of equipment had been purchased during the current year, and for that reason the appropriation was not required to be so great for the next as for the current year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have made an investigation of the matter, and I find that the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota was in error. The total amount expended for equipment during the current year was less than \$25,000, and the estimate for equipment to be purchased in the coming year is in excess of \$35,000. In addition to that I find that there are some special reasons why this appropriation should not be less than it is for the current year. For instance, a number of tests are to be made in connection with the Naval Department for the manufacture and use of briquettes on the naval vessels; and investigations are in progress as to the spontaneous combustion of coals in storage, for which it is estimated there will be required at least the sum of \$30,000. Then there is, in addition, to continue special investigations of coal and lignites on the public lands, for which an estimate is made at \$25,000. Then there is a special investigation of very great importance in connection with the explosions in coal mines and loss of coal and loss of life, for which \$25,000 is estimated as necessary. I am told that over 4,000 men were killed in explosions in coal mines in the United States during the past year, and coal to the amount of millions of dollars' worth was lost. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary that I should say anything about the necessity and the value of these coal tests. That question has already been passed upon, and it is simply a question of the amount of money to be appropriated. The \$50,000 which the Senate has now added to the House appropriation makes the appropriation the same as for the current year. The reason why the \$50,000 was cut off in the House, as given by the gentleman from Minnesota, turns out to have been an error. It turns out, in other words, that the necessity for the appropriation for the next year should be as much as for the current year, and, if these estimates be taken into account, larger than for the current year. For that reason I think the House ought to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania in stating the situation in respect to this \$50,000 addition, or the Senate amendment appropriating \$50,000 in addition to the amount carried in the bill as it passed the House, said that the estimate was reduced \$50,000 in the House upon the statement of the "gentleman from Minnesota," that a large part of that appropriation for the current fiscal year had been expended for the purchase of equipment, and upon that statement the House reduced the appropriation to \$200,000, or the exact amount which by the Senate amendment it is proposed to increase the appropriation. And then the gentleman from Pennsylvania says further that he has since made an investigation and he finds that the statement of the "gentleman from Minnesota" was erroneous. Now, I want to give the House the facts in regard to this matter, and let the House judge as to whether the statement of the "gentleman from Minnesota" or the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in error. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, in discussing this proposition when this bill was under consideration in the committee of the whole last week, said:

With respect to these fuel tests, if the committee will turn to page 572 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations of last year, 1906, it will find outlined in those hearings a complete programme for these fuel investigations, and the statement made that the completion of this programme would require several years. After that testimony was submitted to the committee an appropriation was made for \$250,000, and immediately after the passage of the appropriation a new equipment, estimated for, was purchased, the necessary additional experts were employed, and the investigations, necessarily modified in accordance with the wording of the appropriation act, were inaugurated.

The statement referred to came from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and not from the "gentleman from Minnesota."

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. TAWNEY. Just a minute. I want to complete this. On the next page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3894, the Members of the House will find:

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move now to reduce the appropriation to \$200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Strike out the word 'fifty';" so that it will read '\$200,000.'

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do that upon the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

It was not done on my statement. It was done on the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

that out of the current appropriation of \$250,000 the Geological Survey has bought very expensive machinery for carrying on these tests. It is therefore manifest that they will not need \$250,000 for the service if the service is continued during the next fiscal year.

Mr. DALZELL. Will not the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. TAWNEY. In just a moment. I want to complete the statement. But, Mr. Speaker, the statement of both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself was correct. I now read from House Document No. 691. In the estimates submitted to the last session of Congress for this identical purpose it reads as follows:

For analyzing, etc.: Coal, lignites, etc.—For the investigation of the coals, lignites, and other fuel substances of the United States, in order to determine their fuel values, etc., under the supervision of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, and at such places as he may deem most advantageous (sundry civil act, Mar. 3, 1905, vol. 33, p. 1187, sec. 1), \$200,000.

Two hundred thousand dollars was the estimate for the investigation. Following that:

For the removal of the plant and necessary equipment, \$50,000.

That was the estimate—\$200,000 for the investigation and \$50,000 for the purchase of equipment for making the investigations—and upon that basis Congress appropriated \$250,000 for this service. But when the amendment was offered by myself, the gentleman from Pennsylvania said:

Mr. Chairman, on the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota, I accept the amendment.

That statement was a repetition of his own statement that a large amount of the money appropriated for the current fiscal year for the investigation was for the specific purpose of purchasing equipment, and that appropriation was based upon the estimate submitted, and now it is proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to appropriate for this purpose \$50,000 more than has ever been appropriated for the testing of coals and fuels in any one fiscal year. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be put in the position of doing an injustice to the gentleman from Minnesota. I freely concede that the statement he made to the House was based upon a prior statement made by me. The statement made by me on which the gentleman based his statement I have since found to be erroneous. I concede also that the concession that I made with respect to this appropriation when the gentleman

offered his amendment was made upon the statement as made by him, and that that statement turns out to be erroneous. So that, going back again, perhaps I was the party that made the first erroneous statement, but all the subsequent action of the House was based upon that statement; and I say now that, after a full investigation, I find that that statement was erroneous, and that all the reason that existed as to why we should have an appropriation of \$250,000 for the current year in the current sundry civil bill exists for the having of that appropriation for the coming year in the sundry civil bill, and it is in answer to those necessities, as demonstrated by the work of this Commission, that the Senate has inserted what ought to have been kept in in the House—the \$50,000—so that our appropriation ought to be just as the Senate has made it, namely, \$250,000, and for that reason the House ought to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will say that it matters not to me how much investigation he has made since this House acted upon this proposition; and it matters not from whom he obtained his information, the appropriation of \$50,000 was made at the first session of this Congress for the current fiscal year for buying an equipment with which to make this investigation, and now it is proposed to increase the appropriation for the investigation, because the appropriation during the current year is \$250,000. I call for a vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a few minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. I call for a vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I make the point of no quorum. If the gentleman does not yield me five minutes on this subject, he can bring in his quorum.

Mr. JAMES. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have some time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is under the control of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will yield to the gentleman; I thought he wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I will withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of no quorum?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I feel a great deal of interest in this appropriation to be given for an investigation of the fuel products of the country. There are a large number of coal mines in my district, and I am candid to say that I feel this appropriation is of great importance to the people I represent. Testing the coal is not merely a question of developing an individual industry, but it is for the purpose of developing the coal business of the United States. As I have stated before in this House, the European governments have a government test of coal. When the collier of Great Britain sends his coal to South America, it goes there with a government test. When the captain of a ship enters a port to buy his coal, he has that government test lying before him, and he knows exactly how much fixed carbon and how much fuel material there is in that coal. When the coal of the United States goes to a South American port, you can send the test of an individual chemist, the chemist of the company, but it carries no official authority with it. The result is that our coals are always discriminated against in foreign ports; and the only effort that has been made along this line of testing coal at all is this recent effort on the part of the Geological Survey. Now it is doing great good.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Does the gentleman understand that this appropriation will supply the kind of service he mentions, namely, testing coal for export?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not contend at all that this is an effort to test coal for export. Now, what I do say, and what is evident, is that this experiment goes to my district and goes to the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and goes to the districts of the West. It tests the coal that comes not out of a particular set of mines, but of a particular country. Coals are marked in their character. Say the Pratt seam will be investigated, and if the coal comes out of the Pratt seam it gets the Government certificate. That does not indicate from what mine it comes, but what is represented by that seam of coal. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Can the gentleman from Alabama cite a single instance in which these coal tests have been of practical value to the country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will say to the gentleman that in his own country my understanding is that the effort on the part of these people to take the lignite coals of the West and con-

vert them into briquettes has proved successful and demonstrated that a good fuel material can be made out of coal that was not useful heretofore.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will state to the gentleman from Alabama that the only test made of the coal in my section of country—and we have great quantities of it there, and we know what it is good for, and knew that before the creation of this Bureau—I think the only Government test of the coal from there is an alleged test the result of which was to publish to the world that our coal was not a coke-bearing coal. This was done in face of the fact that we then had coke ovens and a large coke industry in that district.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will state to the gentleman that there is coke and there is coke, and you can make coke out of almost any coal; but you can make coke that when you put it into the furnace it has not strength to bear the burden, and those cokes are practically no good. I do not know anything about the test. It may be that your coal has so much sulphur in it that it would make a weak coke. It would not appear to be different when you had it in your hand, but when the burden is put on top of it it would not bear it, and that is the very purpose of this investigation, and shows that they have accomplished something there.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, touching the question of equipment for this coal investigation, I want to speak for just a moment. The importance of it is hardly questioned by anyone. We all know that the President of the United States, whom I do not always accept as the best and highest authority upon all questions, has recently recommended, and very wisely, as I think, that the immensely valuable coal lands owned by the Government should be so handled as to return the best possible dividend to the people, who own them. It is highly desirable that the country should be advised of the value of those lands, and nothing will so well develop that value as the work done by the Survey.

Now, as to the equipment. Less than \$25,000 has been expended in the present equipment for this coal testing. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] was rather unfortunate in his remarks about it when this bill was under discussion in the House. Less than \$25,000 has been expended. In addition to that, having had put upon them the burden of investigating about 50,000,000 acres—

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from Texas permit a question?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. From what paper is the gentleman reading?

Mr. SLAYDEN. A memorandum.

Mr. TAWNEY. Prepared by the gentleman himself?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No, Mr. Speaker, I went to the authorities on that subject. The gentleman's sneer can not overturn the fact that reputable and honorable gentlemen, who have no personal interests to serve in this matter, have not in the whole course of their lives and will not now tell falsehoods in order to get an appropriation to aggrandize their bureau.

Mr. Speaker, having had put on them, as I started to say, the duty of investigating about 50,000,000 acres of the public lands supposed to be underlain with coal, they will require an additional equipment of the value of about \$35,000 and a certain increase of ten or fifteen thousand dollars, I believe, for chemical and laboratory materials.

I believe that this is a wise appropriation to make. I believe it is in the interest of all the people that it should be made. I believe it tends to make them appreciate, and to make the world appreciate, the value of one of their greatest assets, and that it is good common sense and good business policy to make the appropriation, as recommended by the Senate.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment and to the entire appropriation, for the reason that I contend that the work alleged to be done is of no practical value to the country. We were burning coal in this country for many years prior to the St. Louis Exposition. We knew then that there were conditions under which coal dust would explode, and that there were dust explosions in coal mines. We knew that there was coke-bearing coal; we knew that there was noncoke-bearing coal; we knew that there was coal that was serviceable to the Navy; we knew there was other coal that was not serviceable to the Navy, and it is not shown by anyone that the Navy has accepted or rejected coal because of these tests. No man in favor of this appropriation can point to a single practical test that has been made that has been of service to the whole country. It may be that tests that have



been made have been of practical service to some particular coal field or some particular section of the country that produces coal; but upon the whole no one who is supporting this proposition has pointed to a practical test that has been made that is of substantial value. Now, while this bureau—for it is now a Bureau that is to be permanently saddled upon the country—was making its coal tests at the St. Louis Exposition, which were intended to be temporary and to have an existence only during the lifetime of the exposition, a coal producer in my district offered a carload of coal out of the coke-producing section of that coal field for the purpose of having a test made. He was ignored. A carload of coal from Kansas, 18 miles away from the coke-bearing coal, reached the testing plant at St. Louis. A test was made and a bulletin was published stating that Kansas coal was not a coke-bearing coal. The gentlemen in charge of the tests had no information as to what part of the coal field this coal came from. They simply knew that it was a carload of coal that reached them from the large coal field of Kansas. They made an alleged test and then published a bulletin, containing the statement that Kansas coal would not make coke. As a matter of fact we had a town we call Cokedale, in Cherokee County, Kans., where at the time this bulletin was published there was a large string of coke ovens producing coke. The coke was sold and being burned everywhere in that part of the country. Since the issuance of this bulletin the ovens at Cokedale have shut down because a Government bureau said Kansas coal would not produce coke.

Now, I would like to hear some who favor this appropriation say, before this vote is taken, that these tests are of practical value to the country.

Mr. TAWNEY. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, unlike the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I have no grievance against the work or the reports of the operations of this Bureau. On the contrary, I believe they have been doing a very good work; at least, that the greater portion of the work that they have been carrying on is exceedingly useful, and that their reports in the main have been just and fair and in accordance with the facts.

But in passing upon this matter we must take into consideration not only the character of the work, the amount which may be necessary to carry it on, but we should also take into consideration the decision of the House in regard to other work of the Geological Survey, and the decision that the House arrived at when this matter was first under investigation.

Most of the appropriations of the Survey have been reduced by the united action of the two bodies, indicating an intent on the part of Congress to somewhat limit the activities of the Geological Survey along various lines. The House has already passed upon this particular matter and has passed upon it with the full knowledge, in my opinion, of the facts in the case. It is true that a considerable portion of the appropriation last year was used for the purchase of machinery, and I am of the opinion that a less amount will be required or should be used for that purpose next year. I think it is very much better if this work is to be continued, that it should be continued with a reasonable appropriation, an appropriation sufficient to carry on the work along proper lines, rather than with a temporarily increased appropriation above the amount given for other branches of the service, resulting in all probability in a successful effort to reduce it or wipe it out at the next Congress.

If I were of the opinion that the gentleman from Texas seems to be, that the activities of the Bureau have been directed toward advising the action that has been taken in regard to the public coal lands of the country, I should vote against the appropriation in toto; and if the present policy of the Interior Department relative to the coal lands of the Government continues with the advice of this Bureau, I shall be compelled to oppose the appropriation of a single dollar in the future for this kind of work.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman from Wyoming allow me an interruption?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to say to the gentleman that he evidently misunderstood me. I did not say that the activities of the Geological Survey had led to the position of the President with reference to coal lands. I meant to convey the idea that the action of the President had increased the activities on the part of the Geological Survey.

Mr. MONDELL. I practically understood the gentleman. I want to call his attention to the fact that the orders withdrawing practically all the national coal lands from entry have prevented all coal development in the West, and whatever good this Bureau may have done in the last year, if it had anything to do with proposing that policy and advocating it, or recommending it, it would have been infinitely better for the West had there

been no Bureau of this sort or kind created. To-day, in the face of an increasing demand for coal, all public coal lands are withdrawn from entry, tied up absolutely, creating a monopoly in the hands of those who are already operating coal mines, making it possible for them for the first time in the history of our western country to increase the price of coal at the mines above a reasonable profit above the cost of mining.

This is the condition we find ourselves in to-day, and if this bureau had anything to do with bringing about that condition of affairs, brought about by repeal of the coal-land laws of the land by Executive order, I shall regret that I ever favored one dollar of appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the work which has been carried on under this appropriation has been a highly useful and beneficial work. The men who have had it in charge are most earnest, capable, and efficient men, as in fact are most of the men in charge of the work of the Survey in all branches; but I am not in full sympathy with all the lines of work contemplated for the future, and especially am I not in sympathy with what seems to be a tendency through Government bureaus to commit the Government to permanent paternalistic and socialistic policies.

Mr. TAWNEY. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, none of the arguments which have been made to sustain the appropriations for gauging streams and the making of topographical maps and surveys are available for the purposes of this discussion. The matter of investigating the quality of coal is not a national one in any sense of the word, but is purely a local question. It is a question which affects the States and the owners of coal lands in those States. The attempt to increase this appropriation, it seems to me, ought not to be made now. The House conferees have very generously made a concession in agreeing to an appropriation of \$200,000, and it seems to me that the House ought to sustain the committee in that regard and not pile upon the appropriation \$50,000 more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is not the appropriation as it comes back here just as it was when it went out of the House? It passed the House for \$200,000.

Mr. SULLIVAN. And the amendment now is to increase it \$50,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; and the conferees have not yielded to anything, nor has the committee yielded to anything.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, this is simply another attempt to put upon the Government an expense which properly should rest upon private individuals. There is no reason why the Pennsylvania Railroad or the coal trust should not make these experiments at their own expense. There is no reason why that expense should be saddled upon all the taxpayers of the United States, and I have not heard in the argument of any gentleman upon this side or upon that any good reason for compelling the National Government to pay the bill which properly ought to be paid by the owners of coal mines in the several States of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 78 and concur in the same.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DALZELL), there were—ayes 84, noes 50.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. DALZELL and Mr. TAWNEY were appointed tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 92, noes 50.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The next amendment for consideration is amendment No. 79, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 115, beginning with line 12, insert the following: *Provided*, That in examinations, hereby authorized, of fuel materials for the use of the Government of the United States, or for the purpose of increasing the general efficiency or available supply of the fuel resources in the United States, the Director of the Geological Survey may have the necessary materials collected from any part of the United States where they represent extensive deposits; and it shall be the duty of the Director of the Geological Survey to have examined, without charge, the fuels required for use by the Government of the United States, and to give these examinations preference over other work: *Provided further*, That in publishing the results of these investigations the materials examined shall not be credited to any private party or corporation, but shall be collected and described as representing such extensive deposits.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to this amendment No. 79 and concur in the same.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it is necessary to occupy the attention of the House. This is purely a legislative provision. It is a matter that is embodied in the current sundry civil appropriation bill, and has been always where the appropriation that has already been put into the bill has been made. It went out in the House upon a point of order, because it was new legislation. Undoubtedly it is legislation, but it is good legislation; it is in the interest of the public service, and it is legislation, to repeat what I have said, that we have always had in connection with this appropriation. I can see no reason why there should be any objection made to concurring in the Senate amendment, since the addition has been made to the appropriation.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, if I can have the attention of the House for just a minute I will endeavor to state why, in my judgment and in the judgment of my associates on the conference, this amendment should not be concurred in. The House passed this provision limiting the investigation and the test of fuel upon lands owned by the Government of the United States. The importance of this amendment is the fact that it widens the scope of the investigation and authorizes the Geological Survey to not only test the fuels on the lands belonging to the United States, but to test the fuels belonging to individual coal operators and mine owners. The coal purchased in any section of the country, owned by anybody, or the coal trust, or anybody else, can be tested, and tested at the expense of the Government, under this proposed legislation—

And it shall be the duty of the Director of the Geological Survey to have examined, without charge, the fuels required for use by the Government of the United States and to give these examinations preference over other work: *Provided further*, That in publishing the results of these investigations the materials examined shall not be credited to any private party or corporation, but shall be collected and described as representing such extensive deposits.

The first part of the amendment, "that in examinations, hereby authorized, of fuel materials for the use of the Government of the United States, or for the purpose of increasing the general efficiency or available supply of the fuel resources of the United States," is where the Survey obtains its authority to examine everybody's coal, or every coal deposit wherever located and owned by anybody whomsoever, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this work is of benefit to the corporations that own the great coal beds of this country, they should at least pay the charge and expense of making the investigation if they are unable or have not the facilities to make the investigation themselves. The amendment as it passed the House is limited, as I said, to an investigation of fuel belonging to the United States and for the use of the United States. It was not proposed by the House to extend this investigation into every coal mine throughout the United States and have an investigation made at the expense of the Federal Treasury, as it is now proposed by this Senate amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania moved to concur in.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask the gentleman from Minnesota for a minute or two.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama three minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important for us to concur in this Senate amendment if we wish to carry out the very purpose for which we have made this appropriation. The object of Congress in appropriating \$250,000 for fuel tests, and other appropriations for the Geological Survey all along the line, has not been for the purpose of investigating lands that belong to the Government. The argument has been made here from the beginning, from the very time this survey was inaugurated, that it should cover the space of the United States, and that the words "public domain" meant the United States from the Pacific to the Atlantic oceans, not the mere land that belonged to the Government of the United States. The investigation, if limited merely to the domain that belongs to the United States, would be limited to a few Western States and Territories. It is of as much importance and of more importance to the consumers of coal and the people who use this material to know what is in the coals of Pennsylvania, Alabama, and Illinois as there is in the coals of the western domain, and the real object of this investigation is for the purpose of investigating all the coals of the United States, and the gentleman opposing this amendment seeks to limit the operation of the appropriation merely to the public domain in the western territory and cut that benefit away from the southern, middle western, and eastern people entirely, and therefore I think that the motion should be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House recede.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I presume this motion will be carried, for I imagine that the same interests that increased the appropriation \$50,000 will demand that the major portion of it be used in the Eastern States to determine the value of fuel in private ownership. It is a curious and interesting fact, Mr. Speaker, that while originally practically all the appropriations for the Geological Survey were supposed to be for the development of the public domain, but a limited portion of those appropriations are so used now. The words "national domain" were unquestionably placed in the fundamental law of the Survey with a view of indicating the lands owned by the Government, and for many years the topographic and geological surveys, the stream gauging, and most of the other activities of the Survey were confined very largely to the western country, where the Government has large landed interests, where it has millions of acres of land to dispose of, where it is attempting to develop a vast and undeveloped region; but gradually the eastern brethren began to trench upon those appropriations, these practically the only appropriations of all of the millions of annual appropriations of the Government that are or ought to be peculiarly beneficial to western development.

So year after year smaller and still smaller portions of these appropriations are used in the West on the public domain. But a fraction of the appropriation for stream gauging is now used where the Federal Government owns public lands; but a fraction of the appropriation for topographic surveys is used for the purpose of thus surveying the public domain; but stream gauging is carried on in Massachusetts and Alabama and New York for the purpose of enabling wealthy corporations to determine the amount of available waterpower for their mills and factories, and topographic surveys are carried on in the aid of street-car and trolley companies and other corporations desiring to know the topographical features of large cities and of densely populated regions where they propose to operate.

And so on through all of these appropriations, intended originally to develop the resources of the West, intended to aid in the development of that great region comprising the public domain where we have so many important problems to be determined and solved. Gradually these appropriations have been shifted east of the Mississippi River, until those of us who have stood here year after year fighting for them find that our regions obtain only the crumbs that remain after the older States have received bountiful helpings from the national larder. In many instances wealthy Commonwealths—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to continue for two minutes more.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. Wealthy eastern Commonwealths, where the land is all in private ownership, where private capital is well able to develop all the resources of the region, are clamoring for these paternalistic public appropriations, for they are paternalistic when applied to private industry. They are not paternalistic when they are intended for and used for the benefit and development of the public domain. And so, I say, year after year we find these appropriations passing from the territory for which they were originally intended to other territory where, in my opinion, the Federal Government should make no appropriations for the purpose of enabling individuals or corporations to develop private property.

Mr. Speaker, if the lands of the West were all in the hands of individuals and taxable; if it were not a fact that one-half to four-fifths of our territory belongs to the Government and is therefore not taxable; if we were in position to draw on all our area for the support of our institutions, our people would not, in my opinion, ask for appropriations like this, for then, and in that event they would be paternalistic as they are now when diverted to the development of private lands and private industries.

Give us our domain, pass into the hands of the States or gradually into the hands of private individuals the lands of the West and the West will not be here as a mendicant, asking for Federal appropriations for the gauging of streams belonging to individuals, for the testing of coals belonging to private parties, or for the carrying on of any of these enterprises in the interest of private corporations.

Mr. OLMSTED. How about irrigation?



Mr. MONDELL. We are paying all we receive for irrigation back to the nation.

Mr. OLMSTED. You have not paid back much yet.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, we begin to do so this year, and those funds are not derived from taxation, but from the money received from land sales. In this session we passed a bill which gives to the seaboard and the people along our river systems—and I do not quarrel with that appropriation,—\$80,000,000 for rivers and harbors, a gratuity, while we are to pay back every dollar which we receive for irrigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 79, and concur in the same.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 75, noes 37.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The next amendment in order is amendment No. 80, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the continuation of the investigation of the black sands of the United States, and especially processes for the electric smelting of iron ores, to be immediately available, \$25,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized to make a motion.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 80 and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 80 and concur in the same.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I regard this amendment as the most important of all the amendments to this portion of the bill relating to the Geological Survey. I believe that if the Members of this House understood the actual situation and what the value of this amendment is there would not be a dissenting voice to the motion. One great essential to the manufacturing interests of this country, and especially to the electrical interests of this country, is the possession of platinum. There is not in all the United States a place where platinum can be secured except through the medium of these black sands. The only platinum that is now available for manufacturing purposes is produced in Russia. It is controlled by an English syndicate, and the price of platinum in the market to-day is \$40 an ounce. Now, through these investigations that have been made in the years gone by of the black sands upon the Pacific coast a great many mineral resources have been ascertained, and amongst others the existence of platinum.

To a large extent the experiment made in the investigation of the black sands upon the Pacific coast have been completed, but the black sands of the Gulf coast, the black sands of the entire South Appalachian Range yet remains to be made; and how much there is of hidden mineral wealth in these black sands nothing but an investigation made under Government supervision can disclose. It is the purpose of the provision put in by the Senate, which ought to have been put in by the House, to devote the sum of \$25,000 to make this investigation. The result may be, if we may judge from what has been accomplished in the past, an addition to the wealth of the country many times \$25,000. It is for these reasons that I say the Senate amendment ought to be concurred in by a unanimous vote.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the testimony taken before the committee in reference to the investigation of black sands shows, if it be reliable, and I take it that it is, that we have already discovered that the black sands wasted contain more than four times as much platinum as is annually consumed in the United States. This is not, therefore, an effort to discover whether we can produce platinum in America, because it has already been discovered that the annual waste of these sands carries with it more than four times as much platinum as is consumed now in America.

Not only that, but these investigations of black sands show a production of iron, varying from 5 to 50 per cent, whereas 12 per cent would pay handsomely for the reduction of the iron in the sands. In the face of that it is proposed here not to appropriate \$25,000 for the continuation of the investigation of black sands, but that it shall be extended into an investigation of processes for the electric smelting of iron ore. If it be the duty of this Government to investigate processes for the electric

smelting of iron ore, then why is it not the duty of this Government and the function of this Government to enter upon investigations with the view of discovery in every mechanic art? If it has been discovered that these black sands carry all the way up to more than 50 per cent of magnetic ore, why should not the process of the reduction of the iron be discovered by private individuals, as all other important scientific truth is discovered?

I have not worried the House by talking upon these fuel tests and on the tests of concrete, but the fact is we entered a few years ago, at the St. Louis exposition, into an investigation of these fuels with an appropriation of \$7,500, as I recall. That has grown and grown and grown until now it takes \$250,000 a year to carry on these investigations. I think I see in this proposal for the entering upon an investigation of processes of electric smelting iron ores something which portends hundreds of thousands of dollars of expense a year in the near future. Most of the Departments of the Government have to rely upon the general benefits of their service as the basis of appeal for an appropriation.

Fortunate is the bureau of the Government which, desirous of unlimited expansion, is able to do a little bit of something for many Congressional districts and thereby enlist the support of the people of those districts for that local use. But if we are to launch out and vest authority in the Government and impose upon it the duty of making investigations of discoveries of all kinds in every line of human industry and human endeavor, there is absolutely no limit to the possibilities of appropriations for these investigations.

This investigation of black sands has gone so far as to demonstrate their commercial value for the purpose of producing both platinum and iron, and it is not the duty of this Government now to go on and discover and improve processes of electric smelting of iron ores. That is like what it has done in the fuel tests. The money has been spent not in testing the fuel, but in testing whether the fuels are more productive of power in their original form or when first converted into gas; and they are now taking a step further and are investigating gas engines, and determining what are the best patterns of gas engines. We see how these processes go on. Is it not sufficient for us, having loaded ourselves with the fuel test and the concrete test, to at least wait until we have found whether this is a never-ceasing and never-ending work before we embark in an effort to make scientific discoveries in other lines of human endeavor? I am opposed to this amendment of the Senate because the investigation of black sands has now reached a state where the utilization of these sands is for American industry and enterprise. I am utterly opposed to this amendment, because it provides for embarking in an investigation of processes of the electric smelting of iron ore.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, it is a very common way of attempting to defeat a very meritorious proposition to exaggerate what it is and also to speculate about what it might be. Now, we are not proposing by this provision of the Senate to do anything more than we have been doing under like appropriations from year to year. We are proposing, of course, to investigate and enter upon processes of electric smelting of iron ores; but an investigation of the things that have been done and entered upon by the Geological Survey will show that we have made some very material progress in that direction and that we have brought it about up to the point where we can produce satisfactory results, and we should not stop now and lose the rich fruits of work already done and which will largely be lost if we cease to continue the work so well begun.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] professes to believe that we ought to turn over that result to private individuals and private companies; but in order to make his statement complete he ought to have said that we ought to turn it over to the steel trust and to the great corporations of this country, in order that they may make it a monopoly against the people of this country, rather than have the Government do it and give it over to the people of the country. In the new use of electricity our skilled practical men in the Geological Survey have entered the field for the purpose of determining whether the great black-sand regions of our country and other ores of this country that have always been denominated "refractory" and are utterly useless, could be made useful and could be smelted through the processes of electricity and made valuable. In this day, when we have about exhausted the iron ores that are not refractory from our great mines in Pennsylvania, in Ohio, and on Lake Superior, and elsewhere, it is about time that we were introducing the new process and making the discoveries that will make this valuable ore useful and utilize it and cheapen it. In so far as progress has been made, it promises to save to the people

of this country many hundreds of millions of dollars in the near future, and yet we are now hesitating whether we shall give for this purpose, to carry on these processes, the sum of \$25,000 or leave this matter to go into the control of the great corporations interested in iron ore and steel and let them ultimately get patents from the United States for the new discoveries and hold them for at least a period of seventeen years under patent monopoly. It is for this reason that I have been in favor of continuing this appropriation. The other reasons stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] are equally potential. For fear that there would be any lack of zeal on the part of the Geological Survey, the Senate, in wording this amendment No. 80, says:

For the continuation of the investigation of black sands of the United States, and especially processes for the electric smelting of iron ores, to be immediately available, \$25,000.

I regard that as a very small appropriation for the very great interest involved in it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to account for the reasoning of the gentlemen who advocate this appropriation. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] says that the Government of the United States should make these scientific investigations, because forsooth unless the Government does, private industry may make the examination and obtain a patent upon the process, and in that manner extra charges may be imposed upon the people of the United States. That is a reason which I submit to the House for its own examination without further comment.

The gentleman says further that if this investigation be made, it will result in the gain of hundreds of thousands of dollars by the people of the United States. That statement carries with it the inference that these black sands are already of great commercial value, and it follows unavoidably from that that private industry should pay the expense of making the initial investigation, inasmuch as private industry will ultimately reap the profit of the transaction. Now, if the reasoning of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be followed, every commercial transaction must be preceded by a scientific investigation under the auspices of the Government of the United States. Examine his statement for just one moment. He says that platinum, which can be obtained from black sands, is to-day worth \$40 an ounce, and that the available supply is under the control of an European syndicate. That means that platinum is immensely valuable in the United States to any organization of individuals who will make it commercially available, and it follows from that that there is a sufficient stake hung up now for private industry to warrant it in paying the expenses of this investigation.

And yet in the face of the great value of the article, disclosed by the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, he asks that the Government of the United States be compelled to pay the bills which will ultimately benefit the owners of the territory where these black sands are located.

I could not help admiring the subtle touch of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] when he suggested that the black sands in the Appalachian Range had not yet been investigated. It seemed to me when he made that remark he disclosed a sublime faith in the corruptibility of the minority in suggesting that an appropriation would be useful in certain sections of the United States. [Laughter.] I trust that Members on this side of the House will reject the proposition that is contained in the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and will show by their votes that they still retain a portion of the measure of their original virtue which formerly they asserted by opposing all paternalistic schemes, and vote solidly against this pernicious enterprise, which has no justification in business, sound legislative principles, or in morals. [Applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] who has just taken his seat. His premises, if true, would justify the conclusion that he draws from them, but the fact is his premises are not quite correct. It is necessary in investigating the black sands to ascertain by scientific investigation whether those sands bear this platinum, which is the article we are in search of.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That has already been demonstrated.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. In certain localities.

Mr. SULLIVAN. On the Pacific coast.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. Yes; upon the Pacific coast.

Mr. SULLIVAN. The gentleman is correcting my premises.

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey. I will do so if the gentleman

will let me proceed. The southern black sands have not been investigated, and it is unknown at the present time whether they do or do not contain platinum, although the presumption is in favor of it. Now, this appropriation is to determine whether or not platinum exists in these sands. It is necessary such investigation should be made by the United States Government, because no private individual or company is capable of doing it. The source of platinum at the present time is Russia, and during the Russo-Japanese war the mines were practically abandoned and the price of platinum rose to fabulous figures. Now, the platinum discovered in the black sands has been for the good of this country at large, and served to render this nation, to some extent, independent of the foreign supply. All the electric systems use it to a large extent, and so do the jewelers. This investigation will show whether these sands contain the platinum and whether it is worth while to work them. If the presence of platinum is established private capital will at once be enlisted to obtain it, but in the absence of such determination by a disinterested investigation, such as the United States would make under this appropriation, no private capital will be forthcoming, and these sands will be neglected in the future as they have been in the past.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, if I understand it, sufficient investigation has been made to demonstrate that they can find platinum in paying quantities in the sands of the Pacific coast. It has also been demonstrated that by force of electricity they can extract the iron ore from those sands, although it is difficult to get it in any other way, if not impossible. These experiments or demonstrations have proved that these black sands are of commercial value. What more does the great iron industry need? What more do the great electric industries of the United States need? If there are any industries that possess boundless wealth and capital, boundless resources, that have in their employ great talent, the greatest ingenuity of any class of business in the United States in greater degree than these two industries, I would like to have some gentleman name them. Is it possible that the Government of the United States is to take the lead in individual endeavor? Are the men engaged in these industries of so little enterprise, of so little perseverance, and so little enthusiasm in their work that they will decline to invest the paltry sum of \$25,000 to discover what a mine of vast wealth, as it has been described in this case, there is in these black sands? What reason is there for the Government of the United States not leaving this to individual enterprise? My friend from Ohio says that it is turning it over to the great steel trust. Great heavens! Is there any danger of the United States discovering anything of value? If so, the steel trust will be on hand and they will take it just as soon if the United States discovers it as though the individual discovered it.

It will make no difference about that. It seems to me almost like demagoguery gone mad to say that the United States must invest money in this investigation in order to protect itself from the corporations which are engaged in the manufacture of steel and of iron, and the gentleman says that if they discover the process they will take out patents and make a monopoly of it. Well, it does not prevent a monopoly by the way of the patents, for the United States to make investigations and discoveries.

Mr. KEIFER. Why not?

Mr. PAYNE. Because we would wake up the next morning and find that the man who was employed by the United States, paid by the United States, the cost of whose investigation was paid by the United States, goes over to the Patent Office and gets out a patent upon the process which he has discovered.

Mr. KEIFER. And in every such instance it has been held void.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman from Ohio is mistaken about that.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is mistaken about the law, as he sometimes is; and then they have a monopoly against the citizens of the United States. The United States itself may use the patent, but the citizens of the United States can not, and it is a question that has not been settled yet; as to whether this particular thing is not the property of the citizen employee of the United States and that he can make the United States pay for it. I suspect the only reason why that question has not been settled, is because there is no way now by which they can get into the Court of Claims to bring an action for such a claim as that; but it does not protect the people of the United States, the individuals, the manufacturers from the claim of a patent discovered by the employee of the United States Government. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is no



reason why we should not leave this to individual enterprise; we should never make it a charge upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, just one word. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this proposition was first suggested to Congress in 1905. It was then limited exclusively to the investigation of black sands at Portland, Oreg., where an exposition was then being held. And in the following year, in the urgent deficiency bill, or at the beginning of this Congress, the appropriation of \$25,000 was made in the following words:

To enable the Director of the Geological Survey to complete the investigation of the useful values contained in black sands.

That was to complete the investigation. Now, they propose to start anew not only along the line of investigating black sands, but they propose for the benefit of the steel manufacturers of this country to engraft upon this investigation this language:

And especially processes for the electric smelting of iron ores.

That is a field so wide that no one can begin to encompass it at this time. The investigation that would be authorized by this language would put the Government of the United States in the position of investigating processes of all kinds, as well as instrumentalities and equipment of all kinds, for the purpose of developing the industry of electric smelting of iron ores.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman made any calculation as to how many millions or hundreds of millions of dollars could be used for the purpose of investigating process for the electric smelting of iron ores?

Mr. TAWNEY. I have not. It is not possible for anybody to make even an approximate estimate of that expense.

Mr. MANN. Without a very vivid imagination.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would suggest that the appropriations be coextensive with the appetite of the steel trust.

Mr. MANN. It would go beyond the appetite of the steel trust. It would go beyond even the imagination of my friend from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

Mr. KEIFER. The steel trust does not want it, and is opposed to it.

Mr. TAWNEY. In view of the fact that at the beginning of this Congress it was proposed by Congress and by the Geological Survey itself to complete this investigation with an appropriation of \$25,000 then given, I submit that this House ought not to go on record in favor of further continuing the investigation or embarking upon the business of investigating the processes for the electric smelting of iron ores, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 80 and concur in the same.

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. DALZELL, there were—ayes 56, noes 67.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. TAWNEY and Mr. DALZELL were appointed tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 79, noes 77.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be reported, so that the House will know what it is voting upon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked that the amendment be again reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report Senate amendment No. 80.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 123, nays 142, answered "present" 4, not voting 108, as follows:

## YEAS—123.

Aiken	Burke, Pa.	Dawes	Gardner, N. J.
Allen, Me.	Burke, S. Dak.	De Armond	Graham
Bannon	Burleigh	Deemer	Gregg
Barchfeld	Burnett	Dixon, Mont.	Gronna
Bartholdt	Burton, Del.	Dovener	Grosvenor
Bates	Calderhead	Dunwell	Gudner
Beall, Tex.	Campbell, Kans.	Ellerbe	Hamilton
Bell, Ga.	Cassel	Englebright	Hay
Blackburn	Clark, Fla.	Finley	Hayes
Brantley	Clayton	Foss	Heflin
Broussard	Cole	Foster, Vt.	Higgins
Brown	Dale	French	Hill, Miss.
Brownlow	Dalzell	Galnes, W. Va.	Hinshaw
Brumm	Davey, La.	Garber	Howell, N. J.
Brundidge	Davis, W. Va.	Gardner, Mass.	Hunt

Kahn	Mudd
Kelley	Murphy
Kline	Norris
Knowland	Olmsted
Lafayette	Page
Lee	Patterson, N. C.
Lever	Patterson, S. C.
Liller, Pa.	Pollard
Loud	Pou
Lovering	Rainey
Mahon	Ransdell, La.
Marshall	Reynolds
Maynard	Richardson, Ala.
Meyer	Robinson, Ark.
Moore, Pa.	Samuel

Schneebell	Steenerson
Scott	Sullivan
Sheppard	Talbot
Sibley	Taylor, Ohio
Slayden	Thomas, N. C.
Slemp	Thomas, Ohio
Small	Townsend
Smith, Ill.	Underwood
Smith, Md.	Wachter
Smith, Mich.	Watkins
Smith, Pa.	Webb
Smith, Tex.	Weems
Smyser	Wiley, N. J.
Southall	Wood
Sperry	Zenor

## NAYS—142.

Alexander	Esch	Parsons
Andrus	Fassett	Payne
Babcock	Fitzgerald	Perkins
Bankhead	Fordney	Powers
Bartlett	Foster, Ind.	Prince
Bennet, N. Y.	Fowler	Randell, Tex.
Birdsall	Fulkerson	Reeder
Bishop	Gaines, Tenn.	Riordan
Bowers	Gardner, Mich.	Rucker
Brick	Garrett	Ruppert
Burton, Ohio	Gilbams	Russell
Calder	Gillespie	Ryan
Candler	Gillett	Shackelford
Capron	Glass	Sims
Chaney	Goebel	Smith, Cal.
Chapman	Graff	Smith, Iowa
Clark, Mo.	Granger	Smith, Ky.
Cocks	Greene	Spight
Conner	Hale	Stafford
Cooper, Wis.	Haskins	Sterling
Coudry	Henry, Conn.	Sullivan
Cousins	Hepburn	Tawney
Cromer	Hill, Conn.	Taylor, Ala.
Crumppacker	Holliday	Tirrell
Currier	Houston	Tivstead
Cushman	Hubbard	Wadsworth
Darragh	Hull	Waldo
Davis, Minn.	Humphrey, Wash.	Wallace
Dawson	James	Washburn
Denby	Jones, Wash.	Watson
Dickson, Ill.	Kellher	Weeks
Dixon, Ind.	Kennedy, Nebr.	Wharton
Draper	Kinkaid	Williams
Driscoll	Knapp	Woodyard
Edwards	Knopf	
Ellis	Lacey	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Burgess	Butler, Pa.	Jenkins	Wanger
---------	-------------	---------	--------

## NOT VOTING—108.

Acheson	Flood	Klepper	Roberts
Adamson	Floyd	Lamar	Robertson, I.
Allen, N. J.	Fuller	Le Fevre	Rodenberg
Ames	Garner	Lewis	Saunders
Bede	Gilbert	Lilley, Conn.	Scroggy
Beldler	Gill	Lindsay	Shartel
Bennett, Ky.	Goldfogle	Lorimer	Sherley
Bingham	Goulden	McCarthy	Sherman
Bonyng	Griggs	McDermott	Snapp
Boutell	Hardwick	McKinlay, Cal.	Southwick
Bowersock	Haugen	McLachlan	Sparkman
Bowie	Hearst	McLain	Stanley
Bradley	Hedge	Madden	Stevens, Tex.
Brooks, Tex.	Henry, Tex.	Michalek	Stevens, Minn.
Brooks, Colo.	Hermann	Mondell	Sulzer
Buckman	Hogg	Moore, Tex.	Towne
Burleson	Hopkins	Morrell	Trimble
Butler, Tenn.	Howard	Mouser	Tyndall
Byrd	Howell, Utah	Nevin	Van Duzer
Campbell, Ohio	Huff	Palmer	Van Winkle
Cockran	Hughes	Pearre	Vreeland
Cooper, Pa.	Humphreys, Miss.	Pujo	Webber
Davidson	Johnson	Reld	Weisse
Dresser	Jones, Va.	Rhinock	Welborn
Dwight	Kennedy, Ohio	Rhodes	Wiley, Ala.
Field	Kitchin, Claude	Richardson, Ky.	Wilson
Fletcher	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rives	Young

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the day:

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BURGESS.

For the vote:

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MONDELL with Mr. WILEY of Alabama.

Mr. McLACHLAN with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania with Mr. SHERLEY.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. BUCKMAN with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado with Mr. PUJO.

Mr. BONYNGE with Mr. LAMAR.

Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. BURLESON.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. BEDE (in favor of) with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. SNAPP with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. NEVIN with Mr. MOORE of Texas.  
 Mr. PEARRE with Mr. GILL.  
 Mr. MOUSER with Mr. TOWNE.  
 Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.  
 Mr. LE FEVRE with Mr. RHINOCK.  
 Mr. KLEPPER with Mr. McLAIN.  
 Mr. HOWELL of Utah with Mr. SAUNDERS.  
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.  
 Mr. BOWERSOCK with Mr. FIELD.  
 Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. REID.

For the session:

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

The result was announced as above recorded.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The next amendment for consideration is No. 82, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 116, line 13, before the word "thousand," insert "and fifty," so it will read: "\$350,000."

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make a motion.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do recede from its disagreement to that amendment and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 82 and concur therein.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter that in any exceptional manner affects Pennsylvania, for out of \$480,000 expended last year only \$17,100 were expended in that State. This covers the topographical survey of the whole country, and the whole country is interested in it. It affects every State in the Union.

As this bill was originally reported from the Committee on Appropriations the words "United States," which had previously appeared, were changed to "national domain," intending thereby to confine the topographic survey to the lands owned by the Government, and the appropriation was reduced to \$250,000. But the House, in the Committee of the Whole, struck out "national domain" and inserted "United States." A motion was made to increase the appropriation to \$400,000, but it carried at \$300,000. The Senate has increased the amount to \$350,000, which was just the amount appropriated in the previous year and the year before that for expenditure for topographical surveys throughout the United States. I submit that if \$250,000, the amount proposed by the Appropriation Committee for lands owned by the United States, was a proper appropriation, then \$350,000 is very small when covering all the United States, not confining it to lands owned by the Government itself.

This work, Mr. Speaker, is in progress in every State and Territory in the Union. It is just about half completed now. From all sections there are clamors for this work—from the Government Departments, the War Department, and the Interior Department. The States are interested to such extent that thirteen different States out of their own treasuries have appropriated for the purpose of expediting this survey. I think that the Senate amendment restoring the amount to the same figure which was appropriated in the preceding year and the year before that is certainly a very proper amendment, and I therefore hope that the House will recede from its disagreement and concur in that amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, the amount of money that the Geological Survey can expend in making a topographical survey is limited only by the amount that it can get from the Congress of the United States. The work that is now being done by the Geological Survey in the making of topographical surveys is being done in those States that cooperate with the Geological Survey in making the survey, and if the State is willing to put up \$50,000, the Director of the Geological Survey is willing to take out of this Federal appropriation an amount equal to the amount contributed by the State.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield just for a question? I think the gentleman is in error there, for I find in the report of the Director that money was expended in forty-five

States last year, and only thirteen contributed anything out of their own treasury.

Mr. TAWNEY. The money that is expended in the States that do not contribute is the smallest amount that the Director of the Geological Survey does expend, simply because he wants it to be said on the floor of the House that he is not spending all of this money in the States that contribute aid in making this topographical survey. I say, therefore, that the House deliberately, after full discussion here the other night, voted \$300,000 for this survey during the next fiscal year, and that it is ample to meet the requirements of that service during the next year. And in view of the enormous appropriations at this session of Congress I submit that every man on this floor should vote to keep that appropriation at the amount fixed a week ago, when we voted in favor of \$300,000 for this service. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 82 and concur in the same.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. OLMSTED. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker; but first I would like the amendment to be understood by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The House proceeded to divide.

Mr. OLMSTED. I withdraw the demand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The demand for a division is withdrawn, and the motion is lost.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move now that the House further insist upon its disagreement in this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. TAWNEY, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama as conferees on the part of the House.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the agricultural bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask to dispense with the reading of the report and that the statement may be read.

Mr. PAYNE. Pending that, I suggest to my colleague that he ask the report be considered as read. I desire to raise a point of order against the report. Then, afterwards, if that is decided in his favor, he can ask for the reading of the statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report. The Chair hears no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24815) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 13, 44, 45, 50, 56, 57, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 71, 74, 75, 76, and 78.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66, 73, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, and 89, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "ninety-five thousand seven hundred and sixty dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "one hundred and nineteen thousand two hundred dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, after the word "and," insert "also;" and on page 34, in line 6, after the word "into," strike out the words "interstate or;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 40 of the bill, in line 6, after the word "forests," insert the words "in the District of Columbia or elsewhere;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, after the word "officers," strike out the word "for" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of said amendment, after the word "Congress," insert the words "classified and;" and in the same line, after the word "detailed," insert the words "reports of all receipts by the Forest Service and classified and detailed;" and in line 11 of said amendment, after the word "receipt," insert "and there is hereby appropriated and made available as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to make refunds to depositors of money heretofore or hereafter deposited by them to secure the purchase price on the sale of any products or for the use of any land or resources of the national forests in excess of amounts found actually due from them to the United States;" and in line 26 of said amendment, after the word "sources," strike out the colon and the matter following down to and including the word "reserve" in line 30; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out, in addition to the matter inserted by the Senate; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.

"Salaries, Bureau of Biological Survey: One biologist, who shall be Chief of Bureau, three thousand dollars; one clerk, class 1, \$1,200; two clerks, at \$1,000 each, \$2,000; one clerk, \$900; one messenger or laborer, \$480; in all, \$7,580."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$52,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following:

"Nutrition investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to incur such expenses as may be necessary for the packing, transporting to, and storing in Washington, D. C., of all apparatus now the property of the Government and used in the nutrition investigations, \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "One million and thirteen thousand two hundred and twenty dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "Twelve thousand three hundred and ninety dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "Seventy thousand and fifty dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "Eight million six hundred and ninety-two thousand two hundred and ninety dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "nine million four hundred and forty-seven thousand two hundred and ninety dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. WADSWORTH,  
CHAS. F. SCOTT,  
JOHN LAMB,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

REDFIELD PROCTOR,  
H. C. HANSBROUGH,  
F. M. SIMMONS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT.

The House recedes from amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21 with amendment, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30 with amendment, 31, 32, 33, 34 with an amendment, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43 with an amendment, 46, 47, 48 with an amendment, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66, 70 with an amendment, 73, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, and 89.

The Senate recedes from amendments Nos. 4, 13, 50, 52, 56, 57, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, and 79.

Amendment No. 1 appropriates \$12,000 for the salary of the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with the law recently passed.

Amendment No. 2 increases the salary of the Assistant Secretary from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

Amendment No. 3 increases the salary of the solicitor to \$3,500.

Amendments Nos. 10, 15, 26, and 36 increase the salaries of the Chiefs of the Bureaus of Animal Industry, Plant Industry, Chemistry, and Forestry to \$5,000.

Amendment No. 73 restores the salary of the Director of Office of Public Roads to \$2,750, the amount originally recommended by the House committee.

Amendment No. 16 increases the salary of the chief clerk of the Bureau of Plant Industry to \$2,250.

Amendment No. 53 increases salary of the cashier of the division of disbursements and accounts to \$2,000.

Amendment No. 12 increases the amount for experiments in animal feeding and breeding from \$25,000 to \$50,000. This was the amount originally proposed by the House bill.

Amendment No. 20 increases the appropriation for grain investigations from \$15,000 to \$40,000. The increase was conceded by your conferees to meet the demands for foreign commerce.

Amendment No. 31, granting an increase of \$1,000,000 to the Forest Service, was agreed to by your conferees because of a Senate amendment which requires all receipts from the forest reserves to be turned into the Treasury, and not to be again available by the Forest Service except by direct appropriation.

Amendment No. 34 requires the Secretary of Agriculture to submit detailed reports of receipts and estimates for the Forest Service and estimate of expenditures intended for this service each year, and that all receipts from the Forest Service after July 1, 1907, shall be covered into the Treasury, thus putting an end to the use of those receipts as a "revolving" fund. This amendment further provides that hereafter no forest reserves shall be created nor any additions made within the limits of the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, or Wyoming except by act of Congress.

Amendment No. 41 strikes out that provision of the House bill which provides "that no part of this sum shall be used for the payment of compensation or expenses to any officer or other person employed by any State, county, or municipal government," and substitutes the following: "That any sum used for compensation of or payment of expenses to any officer or other person employed by any State, county, or municipal government shall be reported to Congress in detail."

The Senate amendment was agreed to by your conferees in the belief that it would be perhaps wiser to allow the Department to follow its own plan for at least the first year of the enforcement of the pure-food law.

Amendment No. 48 restores to the bill the salaries for the

Bureau of Biological Survey exactly as it is carried in the current bill.

Amendment No. 70, as amended by the conferees, instead of restoring the item for nutrition investigations, appropriates \$5,000 to bring to Washington the apparatus belonging to the Government which has been used in these investigations.

Amendment No. 89 provides that hereafter, on or before the 1st day of January of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress, in addition to the estimates now required by law, classified and detailed estimates of every subject of expenditure intended for the Agricultural Department for the next fiscal year and detailed reports of all expenditures under any appropriation for each service during the preceding fiscal year.

All other amendments are for correction of totals, slight changes in verbiage, correction of punctuation, restoration of two or three paragraphs stricken out in the House on points of order, but which in no way change the original intent and purpose of the bill.

On careful examination of the bill by the conferees it was found that no authority was given the Forest Service to employ help in the District of Columbia, the words authorizing such employment having been inadvertently stricken from the House bill under a point of order. The conferees therefore recommend the insertion, after the word "forests," in line 6, page 40 of the bill, of the words "in the District of Columbia or elsewhere."

J. W. WADSWORTH,  
CHAS. F. SCOTT,  
JOHN LAMB,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the point of order against the conference report on the ground that the conferees have inserted on page 40 language in an item which was not in dispute between the two Houses. On page 40, line 24, the conferees have changed the text in the language agreed to by both Houses by inserting, after the word "forest," the words "in the District of Columbia or elsewhere."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, Mr. Speaker, I concede the point of order; but the report makes mention of the fact, and my statement calls further attention to the fact. It evidently was a typographical error or an error of some kind by which certain words were left out which authorized the Forest Service to employ help in the District of Columbia. If this is not inserted, the Chief Forester can not pay anybody for work in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] makes the point of order that the conferees have exceeded their authority by changing the text to which both Houses have agreed by inserting, after the word "forest," the words "in the District of Columbia or elsewhere." And the report states that such is the case. Does the gentleman from New York confess the point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do. I simply want the House to understand there was no attempt at concealment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments and ask a further conference.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments?

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. I ask a separate vote on amendment 86 so that I may offer an amendment. It is on page 72.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the vote will be taken on the other amendments in gross.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I ask that the House concur in Senate amendment—

The SPEAKER. Precisely; but the gentleman from New York, in charge of the bill, moves that the House do further insist upon its disagreement upon all amendments, and the Chair is trying to find out how many amendments the motion of the gentleman would include and on which there is a desire for a separate vote.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I ask a separate vote on amendment No. 88.

The SPEAKER. Is there any other amendment on which a separate vote is desired? If not, the vote will be taken in gross on the other amendments, excepting amendments 86 and 88.

No other separate vote was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion

to insist on disagreement to all the other amendments on which a separate vote is not asked.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report amendment No. 86.

The Clerk read as follows:

Survey of and report on Appalachian and White Mountain watersheds: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to examine, survey, and ascertain the natural conditions of the watersheds at and near the sources of the various rivers having their sources in the Southern Appalachian Mountains and the White Mountains, and to report to Congress the area and natural conditions of said watersheds, the price at which the same can be purchased by the Government, and the advisability of the Government's purchasing and setting apart the same as a national forest reserve for the purpose of conserving and regulating the water supply and flow of said streams in the interest of agriculture, water power, and navigation, \$25,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with an amendment which I offer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves to concur in the Senate amendment which has just been read with an amendment. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the Senate amendment numbered 86 by striking out all after the words "to enable the Secretary of Agriculture" and inserting the following: "to examine and ascertain the natural conditions, especially as to forests, of the area of land at and near the sources of all the various streams in continental United States which are of sufficient importance in navigation to have been made the object of expenditure of national money for their improvement, or which have water supplies already utilized for manufacturing or irrigation or capable of such utilization, and to report to Congress the areas and natural conditions of said watersheds, the prices at which the same can be purchased by the Government, and the advisability of the Government's purchasing and setting apart the same for the preservation or propagation of such forests as may be needed to conserve, regulate, or increase the water supply of the before-described streams in the interests of agriculture, water power, and navigation, \$25,000, to be immediately available."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET].

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the distinction between the Senate amendment and the amendment I have offered is simply this: The Senate amendment proposes an examination of the sources of rivers having their sources in the southern Appalachian Mountains and the White Mountains. The amendment which I offer is to broaden that examination and leave it open in order that the Congress may have the information, first, of the particular sections where these rivers rise and where the land ought to be purchased, and, second, what the cost may be. If we start upon a project of this kind, individualizing one particular part of the country—the White Mountains, for example—and then wait for a subsequent Congress to select another particular locality, it will be a never ending project; and, I think, at the outset, before Congress has expended any money in the purchase of these lands for the protection of water supplies, we ought to have a more general examination than the Senate amendment provides, and some additional data, before we determine what the cost may be. We seek only to know all the facts, and Members can not criticise any honorable effort which may be made to ascertain those facts. I insist that if this project is to be entered upon at all, we ought to enter upon it on a broader scale than by the limitation to the southern Appalachian Range and the White Mountains, for the purpose of determining more accurately and comprehensively the facts with reference to the cost of the project. I would be glad if the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] would express his recognition of the necessity and the advisability of first ascertaining all of these facts before entering upon the project and would accept the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of amendment No. 86 is plainly set forth in the language of the amendment itself. It is intended to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make a survey of the Appalachian and White Mountain regions with a view to ascertaining the natural conditions of the watersheds at or near the sources of the various navigable rivers having their fountain heads in these regions, and to report to Congress the number of acres of land involved in these watersheds, the price at which they can be bought, and the advisability and practicability of the Government purchasing them with a view of setting them apart as a forest reserve, in order to conserve and regulate the water supply of the streams which have their origin in these lands. All of this is to be done in the interest of agriculture, to protect the great water powers along these streams, and to aid in making navigable these water courses. This is the plain intent of the amendment, which was put on the agricultural appropriation bill in the Senate through the



efforts of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Senator SIMMONS]. It will be remembered that when the agricultural bill was before the House I had the honor of moving an amendment to appropriate \$3,000,000 for the purchase of sufficient lands in the Appalachian and White Mountain regions out of which to establish a forest reserve sufficient to adequately and economically protect the water courses having their origin in these mountain regions. The point of order was raised against the amendment and was sustained by the Chair. Thereupon, my friend from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS] offered an amendment which, in effect, is the amendment now under consideration. The point of order was raised also against this amendment, and was likewise sustained.

While I shall heartily support this Senate amendment, I must confess that I feel that with reference to the Appalachian Range we have sufficient information and data upon which to pass wise legislation, for it will be remembered that the Department of Agriculture and the Geological Survey, acting together under authority of Congress given some years ago, made an extensive survey of that region, and that report has been submitted to Congress and is now a public document, containing over 100 pages of valuable and detailed information.

However, be that as it may, the friends of the idea of establishing forest reservations in the Appalachian and White Mountain ranges are now brought face to face with an adroit and carefully concealed effort to defeat the whole proposition.

The substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] is an indirect attempt to defeat all legislation looking to the establishment of these forest reserves. The substitute of the gentleman proposes to make an examination and to ascertain the natural conditions of the area of land at or near the sources of all the various streams in continental United States, and for this purpose appropriates \$25,000. That the purpose of the gentleman from Indiana can be accomplished for this sum of money is absolutely ridiculous, and no one better knows it than the gentleman himself. The truth is that the adoption of the substitute is intended to load down this proposition for the purpose of defeating the ends sought by the Senate amendment. The gentleman from Indiana says he wants the facts. We, too, want all of the facts in regard to this proposition. We are quite willing to have the facts, so far as we are concerned on this side, and, I think, as far as all of the friends of this proposition are concerned, but we are not willing to load down the proposition with another proposition covering the entire country—all of continental America. We are opposed to the substitute of the gentleman from Indiana, and I trust that the friends of the idea of forest reserves for the Appalachian and White Mountain regions will line up and vote it down, so that the House may concur in the Senate amendment and permit the survey passed by it to be made, in order that some of the objections raised against the bill to make a direct appropriation for the purchase of these regions may be met.

With respect to the Appalachian regions, Congress now has sufficient information upon which to act wisely, but a survey of the White Mountains is necessary to ascertain the facts upon which to base economical and wise legislation.

The substitute of the gentleman from Indiana is evidently sinister to the whole scheme of forest reserves in these mountains, but even if it were made in good faith its adoption would mean a delay of from three to five years before any final conclusion could be reached and before sufficient information could be had upon which to act.

This bill has been knocking at the door of Congress for years and years. We have an opportunity now to get the facts upon which Congress can act. The Senate has sent this amendment to us. It is up to us to stand by that amendment in order that we may get the facts, and the friends of this Appalachian-White Mountain proposition will make a great mistake and delay the final creation of these reserves many and many years, and perhaps defeat them finally, by the adoption of the substitute. I wish to say, without imputing to him any motives, for I would not do that, that this substitute has been drawn by a master hand, for if he had studied for years a scheme by which to defeat this whole proposition I do not think he could have found a more effective one by which to do it. It is a drag-net proposition which appeals to the selfishness of every Member of the House, and all of us have more or less of that in us. If the gentleman from Indiana is opposed to the creation of forest reserves in the White Mountain and Appalachian regions, and if it is his purpose to stand up against the strong recommendation of two Presidents of his own party and to place himself against the judgment and the wishes of twelve great States and numerous commercial and civic organizations, not to take into account an undoubted majority of this House, then let the gentleman

say so in plain terms and let him make his fight in the open daylight and without any attempt at concealment. Let the friends of the proposition to create forest reserves in these mountain regions not misunderstand the purpose of the substitute. This is really but the opening gun in the battle that is to be fought over this proposition, and to suffer defeat now means everlasting defeat. To defeat the substitute of the gentleman from Indiana means that we control the situation and in the end will force upon Congress a recognition of the justice of this proposition. This, in a way, is a test vote, and yet, because of the drag-net and thin-butter-spread character of the substitute. I do not feel that the vote which is soon to be taken will be a correct evidence of the real strength of the proposition. So adroit is the substitute that it is certain to fool some of us. I trust, therefore, that the House will vote down the substitute offered by the gentleman, so that we can concur in the Senate amendment and let this proposition get before the Sixtieth Congress in order that the House may have an opportunity to express itself upon it. And when such an expression is had, I believe that the wisdom of the American statesmanship will find its vindication in the adoption of the idea of forest reserves in these mountain regions, thereby answering the appeals of the agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial interests of the New England and Southern States. [Applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS from North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the evident purpose of the amendment to the Senate amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is to kill the whole proposition for a survey of the Appalachian and White Mountain forest reserves. There are a great many Members of this House from New England and the South who believe that we should have at least an investigation of the facts relating to these proposed forest reserves in New England and the South. We are vitally interested in this matter. Now, what does the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana propose? He proposes to have a survey and an investigation of all the watersheds in the United States. The effect of the adoption of that amendment would be necessarily to defeat the whole proposition advocated by New England and the South. What are we asking for in the Senate amendment? Let me read the amendment inserted in the Senate to the agricultural appropriation bill. It is a simple, plain proposition. I want the House to hear it in full:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to examine, survey, and ascertain the natural conditions of the watersheds at and near the sources of the various rivers having their sources in the Southern Appalachian Mountains and the White Mountains, and to report to Congress the area and natural conditions of said watersheds, the price at which the same can be purchased by the Government, and the advisability of the Government's purchasing and setting apart the same as a national forest reserve for the purpose of conserving and regulating the water supply and flow of said streams in the interest of agriculture, water power, and navigation, \$25,000, to be immediately available.

This is a very small appropriation. The purpose of it is simply by a survey to get at the facts with reference to the advisability of establishing forest reserves in the White Mountains and the Appalachian regions. For years we have been knocking at the door of Congress, asking Congress to do something in the way of an appropriation for these forest reserves. We believe in New England and in the South that such legislation means not only the preservation of the agricultural lands, but also the conservation of our water power for manufacturing purposes, and that means millions of dollars to the people of New England and to the people of the South. We are simply asking to have the facts investigated, the survey made, and then, if advisable, we can go a step further in the passage of the bill to establish the reserves. If not advisable and to our national interests, we can stop with the survey.

It seems to me the adoption of the Senate amendment is in the interest of the economic administration of the Government. We are simply endeavoring by a survey to ascertain whether we ought to establish these forest reserves in the White Mountains and the Appalachian region; then after a survey is made we can tell whether the Congress of the United States ought to act favorably upon the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture establishing these reserves.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina whether the Senate amendment ought not to provide, as well as "ascertaining the natural conditions," also for ascertaining the natural and "existing" conditions, because I understand there has been a pronounced change in the character of the surface of the earth in the Appalachian region, especially, and more or less in the White Mountains. The amendment ought to provide for disclosing the natural conditions and the existing conditions.

Mr. BURLESON. A change in the natural conditions?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. BURLERSON. Then would not that be still the natural condition?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Not at all, you may say, in the sense of not being artificial, and so disclose the whole situation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am inclined to think the gentleman from Maine is right.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. The gentleman may be right, but my idea is that the words "natural conditions," as the gentleman from Texas has suggested, would include existing conditions.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. You might strike out the word "natural," and say "ascertain the conditions," and that will give us what the situation is.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I see no objection to amending the Senate amendment in that way.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I would be very glad, with that amendment, to vote for the Senate amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] will be voted down, and I hope that the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Maine will be adopted. The expenditure of this small amount for survey will give us the facts and may save millions to the agricultural and manufacturing interests of New England and the South. [Applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I favor the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], and in taking this position I do so from the standpoint of one who thoroughly believes in our forest-reserve movement. A great deal of criticism has been let loose in both ends of the Capitol upon the general administration of the forest reserves. For one, I have little sympathy with the criticism. I have lived for a quarter of a century in a locality where I have been a close observer of this system. I live on the edge of one of the oldest forest reserves of the entire system, where I have had opportunity to observe both the old method and the new. I therefore favor this amendment, because I think it will in a sensible and legitimate way ascertain the necessary facts regarding this great region of the East and South before the Government shall embark specifically upon the enterprise.

I think that public sentiment is rapidly growing to an understanding of the fact that the great forest and water resources of the country must be administered in a conservative way for the benefit of this as well as future generations. When the Black Hills Forest Reserve was established in 1898 you could scarcely find one man in a thousand who was not opposed to the idea. The practical management and working out of this idea has been so successful that I challenge anyone to find now one man in a thousand in that immediate vicinity who does not recognize its great benefits. One of the mistakes made in the establishment of the forest reserves in the western country has been that there has not been sufficient inspection in advance before the boundaries of the reserves have been established. As a result of this boundary lines have been too carelessly drawn, in the first instance, and large areas not needed for the cultivation or preservation of timber, but better adapted to grazing and agricultural purposes, have been unfortunately included in some of the forest reserves. It is because of this that the reserve system has, to a certain extent, come before the country with a great deal of criticism attached to it. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana would give a thorough investigation of the necessary data upon which Congress could act intelligently in the near future.

We have now in the United States 139 forest reserves, embracing 129,000,000 acres. I will publish with my remarks a list of these reserves, showing the dates when established and the acres of each. It is a noticeable fact that the Senators and Representatives who are objecting to the public forestry movement come from States where the reserves were but recently created. The free pioneer of the West is accustomed to free range, free water, and free fuel, and he at first resents the reserve system as an interference with the time-honored rights of an American citizen. But he soon discovers that the forest supervisor and forest rangers are the best friends of the honest and permanent settler—protecting the forests against destruction by fire, conserving the water resources for the common good, and apportioning the range privileges on an equitable basis, so that all may receive a reasonable share of these benefits.

The act passed at the last session of Congress providing for agricultural settlement in forest reserves was a wise measure. Most of the forest reserves of the West are traversed by fertile valleys. There are some of the best agricultural lands in the

country, and being well watered and in close proximity to fuel and building materials they present some of the best opportunities for permanent home building. The permanent settlers in forest reserves take a lively interest in the protection of the timber and water supply. They are usually organized by the forest rangers into an auxiliary force, and can be called into action quickly in case of fire or other emergency.

Our national forestry movement came none too early. The ruthless devastation of the protecting forests at the sources of our rivers was seriously affecting the regular distribution of our water resources. The inevitable effect was torrential floods during the season of rain and melting snow and an insignificant flow during the months of summer and fall. Private greed too often fells the young growing timber as well as the mature trees, and tops and branches are allowed to dry on the ground where they fall, making fuel for forest fires.

Before the Government took the public forests into its own control vastly more timber was destroyed by fire than was taken for commercial uses. The people are beginning to understand that trees are to be protected and grown like any agricultural crop and that only the mature product is to be gathered from year to year. This system is necessary for the best interests of to-day as well as for the generations of the future.

The Black Hills Forest Reserve affords a good concrete illustration of what may be expected from our forest reserve system. It is at present our most important reserve from a commercial standpoint. The large mining operations in that vicinity require vast quantities of mining timber, and lumber and building material are in constant demand in the neighboring towns and agricultural valleys. These demands are now met without destroying the immature trees.

This reserve is about 100 miles long by 40 miles in width. It is a delight to ride through the reserve and see the thrifty young forests springing up on every side. Thousands of acres are now covered with dense vegetation that were comparatively barren until the system of forest patrol was established.

I prophesy that Senators and Members of Congress who are now rebellious against this national forestry movement will be won over among its supporters when they have opportunity to see what the reserve system can accomplish. I have only words of commendation for the Chief Forester, who is the real head of this national movement. He has dedicated his life to a great idea that promises only good for the entire country. He brings to this Service the devotion and enthusiasm of a high purpose, and should receive the cordial support of both branches of the Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL].

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] and am in favor of the adoption of the Senate amendment as amended in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine. I do not think that anything will come from the proposed dragnet and general investigation. If a proposition were up for some particular river or harbor improvement, it would be just as sensible to amend it by proposing to investigate all the rivers and harbors of the country. If there is anything to be investigated in connection with our western forest reserves, let that be done; but this is a distinct proposition. A bill has passed the Senate and has passed the committee of the House in favor of establishing two great forest reserves. There are at least fifteen States interested in those reserves. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has none of the forests within her area, but she is vitally interested in having the sources of her rivers protected. And it is for the purpose of specially investigating this clear-cut and definite proposition that this appropriation is proposed. The bill establishing these forest reserves would, in all probability, have received consideration at this session of Congress if it had not been for the indefinite character of some of the information upon it and the lack of knowledge as to the extent to which the Government would be committed; and this survey is in the direction of educating the next Congress so it may understand precisely what the proposition means. An appropriation of \$25,000 for the forest-reserve system and water courses of the whole country, as proposed by the Overstreet amendment, is absurdly small. It will have to be followed up by millions, and the gentleman from Minnesota will be fighting here, as he has been fighting through this Congress, the appropriations proposed for making other investigations and maps and surveys than those of the Geological Survey. I trust the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana will be voted down and that then the Senate amendment as amended will be passed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].



Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important question, involving the respective spheres of activity of the States and the Federal Government. The partial solution of that question by the civil war and other events has already added many pages to the history not only of this country, but of the world. Even those who believe in the unlimited power and authority of the Federal Government may well shrink before some of the undertakings which have recently been entered upon by the Federal Government, and we ought to consider a proposition of this kind very carefully before we adopt it; but if we are to adopt it at all, should we not bear in mind that all portions of the country should be treated alike? [Applause.] The great danger is that when the Federal Government infringes upon the responsibilities and functions of States partiality will be shown, that one locality will assert its claims or rights to the detriment of all the rest. I may say with reference to the branch with which I have had most to do in this House, that of rivers and harbors, that there is no justification for the taking up of that class of work by the Federal Government unless the scales are held with absolute equality and all portions of the Union—North, South, East, and West—are treated alike. And just so it is in this matter. If we are to enter upon these surveys as to the waters on the watersheds, surveys of water power, or anything of that kind, the investigation should not be directed to one part of the country, but to the whole country alike, and so I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CURRIER].

Mr. CURRIER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio has said that the entire country should be treated alike in this matter, but this appropriation is for a specific purpose which has already received the sanction of the Senate which has passed the bill for these two forest reserves and the sanction of this Committee on Agriculture of the House, which unanimously reported the bill. It is true, of course, that it can not receive any consideration at this session, but this matter will be up again, and we want to be able to tell the committee and the House the natural conditions regarding this matter and lay before them the facts as to the cost of the proposed reserves, so that this matter can be acted upon intelligently by the committee and by the House. If this matter is to be beaten, let it be beaten in a square and manly way and not by indirection [applause], for whatever may be the intention of the mover of this proposition this amendment in fact destroys this whole thing. Talk about a survey of all the navigable rivers of the country and all the watersheds at the expense of \$25,000! Why, it is absolutely ridiculous!

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. There is no such proposition for a survey. The word "survey" is not in there.

Mr. CURRIER. Any such examination as you are talking about, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Lakes to the Gulf, would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. It would take years to make any such investigation.

Mr. MANN. Would not the Secretary of War under the substitute have the authority to first make investigation of the Appalachian and White Mountain propositions?

Mr. CURRIER. No other proposition has been pending in this Congress. This has not only been pending, but has passed the Senate and has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Agriculture. It is one specific provision, and we ask for this small appropriation in order that at the next Congress we may lay all the facts before this House. It is a reasonable request.

Mr. MANN. Could not the Secretary have the authority?

Mr. CURRIER. He may have the authority. We want him directed to do it.

Mr. SOUTHARD. What is the objection to directing him?

Mr. CURRIER. None. The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] leaves him open to wander all over this country to make an investigation.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Will the gentleman allow me to say that this simply gives an intelligent examination and investigation of the question for future action.

Mr. CURRIER. That we may present this matter fully to the next Congress and to this committee. I am not going into the merits of this project, but if you would give us these reserves we would save in our river and harbor bill alone three times over the cost of the reserves in the next five years in preventing the filling up of streams. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be beaten. Let the reserve bill at some time come before this House, and if you want to vote it down there will be no murmur from us; but beat it squarely and in the open.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have a love for everything in the forest, from the tiniest plant to the loftiest tree; and I believe—and have for years—that it might be desirable for the General Government to own and control a forest reservation in the White Mountains and in the southern Appalachian region. But before I would be willing to cast my vote in favor of such a proposition I must know what the effect will be on the adoption of that policy. I can see in my mind's eye, Mr. Speaker, in the not far distant future that this country may adopt the policy which has been adopted by some of the foreign countries, and may adopt the plan of conserving its future interests by the establishment of forest reservations. And when my distinguished friend from New Hampshire [Mr. CURRIER] and my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], through selfish interests in favor of their local projects, object to the survey of the rest of the country and to giving us the information which we need before entering upon the scheme, I think the gentlemen are shortsighted.

Mr. CURRIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. CURRIER. Whenever you will bring in a project here which will receive the approval of the Senate and is unanimously reported by this committee, we will vote to give you a survey.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to that great legislative body at the other end of this Capitol, its sanction to me contains no weight. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, the gentleman wants this proposition. Why not let us know what the plan will cost? Under the proposition contained in the substitute amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture, which means the Chief of the Forestry Division, may enter upon an investigation of these two projects and report upon them at the next session of Congress if he be able to do so.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to say to my friend from Illinois—

Mr. MANN. I will yield for a question; I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to ask my friend from Illinois, then, that if to ascertain these facts is not the very purpose of this amendment here?

Mr. MANN. Ah, the amendment of the Senate proposed to commit this Government to a policy about which it knows nothing as to cost. I want information before entering upon a project which is to cost not millions of dollars, but billions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD].

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will say, Mr. Speaker, first, that the longing the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has for information before he embarks on a large enterprise involved in the expenditure of a large sum of money will be gratified if the Senate amendment to this bill passes. That is the precise and specific object of this amendment—to get the necessary information in order to enable intelligent action to be taken thereon; and the gentleman can gratify his love for all of the various things that grow in the forests on the basis of that information provided this amendment passes. I am very much interested, and I agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the proposition that everything should be applied equally and alike; but it depends somewhat on the situation as to whether that applies in every respect. I have yet to learn that because we surveyed one river or one harbor that all the rivers and all the harbors are to be surveyed.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman that what I was dealing with was all of the same class.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I so understood it.

Mr. McCALL. The proposition is that they were all to be surveyed at the same time.

Mr. MANN. The rivers to be surveyed in New England?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Not at all. But looking at it in the way that the learned River and Harbor Committee exercises its judgment as to the rivers that shall be surveyed and as to the harbors that shall be surveyed, wisely and properly; but I want to say to the House that they did not survey every harbor and every river, and I can call a great many men in this House as witnesses to this fact.

Now, this amendment contemplates, with all due deference to the gentleman from Indiana who introduced it, a survey of all areas that are the sources of all the various streams in continental United States "which are of sufficient importance to navigation to have been made the object of expenditure of

national money for their improvement, or which have water supplies already utilized for manufacturing or irrigation," because the amendment requires the Secretary to report to Congress the areas and natural conditions of such watersheds.

How is the Secretary going to report an area without in the first place determining the area; and how will he determine it without a survey? Of course it is all well enough by this amendment to provide it shall be done, but how is he going to do it without doing it; how get areas without surveys?

Now, this proposition appropriates \$25,000 for a survey of all sources of water supplies of the United States. Absolutely preposterous from every possible financial standpoint! The amendment is not seriously intended to promote this object. Now, what is the proposition here? Why, that the great watersheds that have been generally discussed as being essential and necessary to the preservation of great water supplies, not only for navigation, but for manufacturing and for the development of power. Now where are the watersheds that have been the main subject of discussion? Where are they in any other section than those to which attention has been called and which are provided for in the Senate amendment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Adirondacks shed is a very important one.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. If you want to put in the Adirondacks, put it in, and add \$12,500 to your appropriation, which would take care of that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not sure that it would.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. When you undertake to adopt this proposition putting \$25,000 to survey a thousand areas, why, it is indirectly undertaking to defeat the proposition. Now, let us have by the appropriation of \$25,000 the information that we all want, and then we can tell whether it is wise to proceed. I hope the Senate amendment will prevail and the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana will be voted down.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask attention to the effect that this will have upon the people of the State of Massachusetts. I have received a great number of petitions from people living in New England in favor of the White Mountain and Appalachian forest reservations. We have been urged to join with the southern Members, the men who come from the States of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee, to endeavor to save the forests for the purpose of properly conserving the water supply of all those States. This project has been well considered for a number of years. It has received the thought and the attention of many people. It has been presented before committees of this House and of the Senate, and it comes here with the indorsement of thousands of men—engineers and technical men as well as the ordinary people in all these communities. Why should we, therefore, be balked in carrying out a good plan merely because gentlemen urge an amendment which on its face may appear fair, but the main and ultimate purpose of which is absolutely to kill the survey of the White Mountains and the southern Appalachians?

We find in the White Mountains the source of five streams—the most important streams in New England for the purpose of developing manufacturing and power. Two of those streams, the Connecticut and Merrimac, rise in New Hampshire and flow to the sea through Massachusetts. The Connecticut is navigable in both Connecticut and Massachusetts. The Merrimac is navigable in Massachusetts. In neither Massachusetts nor Connecticut can we control the depletion of the forests in New Hampshire and the grievous injury thereby caused to our interstate streams both as to navigability and supply for power for industrial purposes. The same is true as regards the rivers rising in New Hampshire and flowing through Maine to the sea. It is an interstate, not a State, matter and is therefore national in its scope.

We find in the southern Appalachians, in Maryland, the Virginias, the Carolinas, Tennessee, and Alabama, the sources of the streams which in the future will yield a great power supply, increase our industrial development and wealth, as well as streams which in their lower reaches form the highways of commerce. This project has been carefully looked into. Why, now, because some gentlemen desire to block it as it has been blocked for a long time, should we vote for this amendment? Gentlemen say we should survey all watersheds en bloc. The rivers and harbors of our country are not surveyed altogether at one time. They are surveyed seriatim and in detail. All the work of the Government on rivers and harbors is done seriatim and in detail and not in one block or comprehensive plan.

Looking at the map of the forest reserves of this country, we find that the whole western country is covered with these re-

served forest areas, but in the East there is not one forest reserve. It is just as important for us in the East to have our industrial or power water supply and the water in our rivers for commercial or navigation purposes cared for as it is to locate these great forest reserves in the West for irrigation. It seems to me that any man who believes in this principle of the conservation of water supply will vote for the amendment put on by the Senate and vote against the proposition of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET]; because if we vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana we will endanger the White Mountain and Appalachian survey. If there be other areas, the Adirondacks or anywhere else, let them come forward in due time, and, after they receive proper committee consideration, let us vote upon them; but concerning this present matter, we now know its beneficial effect; we have it in a shape where we can accomplish some good. Let us therefore vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, and then vote to concur with the Senate on the proposition for \$25,000 for the survey of the White Mountains and the southern Appalachian region. [Applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, so far the Federal Government has established forest reserves on the public domain only. The amendment incorporated in this bill by the Senate proposes to establish forest reserves by acquiring property that has been reduced to possession and control by individuals in the several States. It is an entirely new departure. It is something to which, at least on this side of the House, it would be natural to expect some opposition. But if it is to be done at all, Mr. Speaker, it should be done without regard to the section of the country. Why should my State be discriminated against? It has expended more than \$20,000,000 to conserve its forest reserves and to protect its watersheds. If the Federal Government is to go into these other States in order to do that work for them, why should not my State be reimbursed for its expenditure? The State of Pennsylvania, if I be not mistaken, has expended large sums from the State treasury to create forest reserves and to protect the watersheds within that State. Should not the Federal Government reimburse that State for that work?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I should like to ask the gentleman whether, in his judgment, this is not strictly a national project; and, second, suppose the cupidity of lumber cutters in the State of New Hampshire causes the depletion of the timber there and causes a diminution of the waters of a stream which flows from New Hampshire down through Massachusetts to the sea, what means has the State of Massachusetts of protecting that stream and protecting a navigable river of the United States?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if that argument is to be conceded, and I will not challenge it at this time, it justifies the Federal Government in interfering in every case where some wrongdoer in one State creates an evil condition in another State. I am not ready to admit that to be advisable. But if we are to embark upon this new policy of having the Federal Government go into the different States to establish forest reserves, not upon the public domain but by the acquisition of land now held by private interests and subject to State control, then when we initiate the policy we should do it in such a way that the Federal Government may go into every State where it would be desirable to protect the watersheds of rivers that are navigable and that run through more than one State. For that reason I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana. Let us have this "square deal" about which we hear so much.

The Senate amendment can be analyzed very easily. It is a combination between those representing the New England States and those representing the States that will be benefited by the acquisition of the land in the Southern Appalachian chain. They are united not because of community of interest, but because of community of plunder. Such a combination has never been seen before in this House.

Mr. McNARY. Without making any comment upon the gentleman's last remark, I should like to ask him if he has ever advocated certain surveys and improvements in the waters of New York Bay, without reference at all to having the whole country surveyed and the waters of every other bay improved?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I have not.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman let me ask him—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me answer the gentleman. I say I have not.

Mr. McNARY. Let me ask the gentleman whether or not he has proposed any specific surveys or favored any surveys or specific improvements for New York Harbor?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know what the gentleman's question



is, and I am glad to say to the House that I have an unblemished record. I have never proposed any survey. I have asked the Congress to provide money to continue improvements that were in the course of being made, but I have not, so far as I can recollect at the present time—I may be under a misapprehension. [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The gentleman does not think of any now. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. But regardless of that, I do not believe that any gentleman in this House believes that an amendment to a river and harbor bill for surveys for new projects is on the same plane as this project; that is a general and settled policy upon which the Government has embarked.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 23650) to quiet title to lands on Jicarilla Reservation and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cause allotments to be made and to dispose of the merchantable timber, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CLAPP, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. TELLER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13605) to satisfy certain claims against the Government arising under the Navy Department, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FULTON, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. McLAURIN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bill of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 95. Joint resolution relating to proceedings to set aside deeds alleged to have been made by Mexican Kickapoos.

S. 8614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery in the District of Columbia," approved June 3, 1896.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 25039. An act to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Ariz., to use the proceeds of certain municipal bonds for the purchase of the plant of the Phoenix Water Company, and to extend and improve said plant.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, that consistency is the rarest of all jewels has, it seems to me, been very clearly demonstrated in the course of this debate by the remarks of the learned and talented gentleman from Massachusetts, who perhaps is the most earnest and forceful defender of the rights of the State, at least on this side of the House. In the course of his remarks against the pending amendment, he suggested that he desired to invoke the strong arm of the Federal Government in behalf of the people of Massachusetts as against the rights of the States, and the people of the States lying at the headwaters of the rivers that flow through Massachusetts, and that are utilized in that great State to a considerable extent for manufacturing purposes.

And when we gaze on the other side of the Chamber and note these gallant defenders of State rights, these strict constructionists of the Constitution, these gentlemen who at all times hotly insist that the Federal Government shall not invade the sacred rights of the sovereign States, we discover that when it comes to the establishment of forest reserves and the securing of an appropriation, lo and behold, they are not only willing, but anxious that the Federal Government shall acquire and establish jurisdiction over vast areas of territory, and their voice and vote is against the rights of the sovereign States to jurisdiction over their territory, and in favor of making such jurisdiction in favor of Federal bureaucratic control.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are to embark on this paternalistic, imperialistic, and centralizing policy, if it is true that this is an empire and not a republic, if we have not a nation of independent and sovereign States which, under the Constitution, have the right and ought to manage their own affairs; if, on the contrary, the Federal Government should go abroad, buy land at high figures, establish its sovereignty, without regard to the interests of the people of the States—if we are to do this, Mr.

Speaker, let us do it with our eyes open; let us know what it means and what it is going to cost. Would it cost \$10,000,000 for the White Mountains and \$100,000,000 for the Appalachian Reserve and a thousand million for all of these great forest and game preserves? If that is the amount that it is going to cost, let us know about it, and let us know what this establishment of Federal power and control over vast areas will lead to. Let us know how far it goes, what its interference with the rights of the States is to be, and what will be the ultimate outcome of it. Does it mean great game preserves in which the favored few—not the citizens of the State who should enjoy the preference rights to which they are entitled under State governments, but favorites of officials having charge of the forest reserves—are to be allowed to go in and hunt and fish and enjoy all the sylvan delights of these great imperial and royal preserves? If that is a good policy for us to start upon, let us know what it means, where it is going to lead us to, and, above all, how much it is going to cost, and the only way to find out is to have the examination proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, which I hope will be adopted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], a member of the committee.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], but I want to remind him that his plea for State rights is coming rather late, when he already has in the West 127,000,000 acres in forest reserve.

Mr. MONDELL. Not by our fault, I will say to the gentleman, and we will gladly surrender at least 100,000,000 acres of those reserves.

Mr. LEVER. We would be very glad to take that in the Appalachian and White Mountain ranges.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I would suggest that they have an irrigation proposition in the West which involves exactly these questions, the limit of which nobody yet knows, in millions.

Mr. MONDELL. All of which is to be paid back into the Federal Treasury; not a penny of which is a gift.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is the expectation, but it has not been paid back yet.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield the floor. I have only two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the 127,000,000 acres under forest reserve, they have their great irrigation scheme out there, and we people over here support it gladly because we think it is a good work.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield.

Mr. MONDELL. Is the gentleman willing to pay for these reserves, as we pay for the irrigation?

Mr. LEVER. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman supports the substitute to the Senate amendment because he says he wants the facts. The gentleman must know that the very purpose of the amendment is to get the facts that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] speaks about. The Senate amendment proposes to ascertain the cost of the land, to ascertain the natural conditions of the streams and the amount of water power, and all such important information. The very thing the gentleman wants we are trying to get in this amendment, and I do trust that the friends of this proposition will vote down the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET].

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending in this House, I am informed, one bill which asks for an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the purchase of a part of this Appalachian Range.

Mr. LEVER. Three millions of dollars.

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. I think there is one bill calls for \$10,000,000. This amendment of the Senate seeks to fasten upon Congress a policy which would lead directly to that character of purchase. The forest reserves to which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has referred in the West are reserves of public lands.

Mr. LEVER. Let me ask the gentleman—

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. No; I decline to yield. They are not the purchase of private property. The very fact that the Congress has entered upon the project of irrigation in the West ought to challenge our attention to the importance of going slowly into a new project before we commit the Government to those large expenditures. We should know more of the

facts necessary to base our judgment upon some reasonable grounds. We have no information as to what particular section will be next in order for this survey and examination, and I am in favor of the ascertainment of those facts before we have gone too far to retrace our steps. I think that the Members of this House should take a second thought before they commit the Government to such a condition of affairs, and I appeal to that second thought of the Members, and I believe that when it has been properly exercised they will agree that it is far better to adopt the amendment than to embark upon the project of the survey of these two particular sections of the country with a view to their purchase.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I would like to ask the gentleman why his proposition does not commit the Government just as much as that involved in the Senate amendment?

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. I am very glad the gentleman asked me that question. It gives us an examination of sufficient latitude to have some sort of information of the final cost. If we bring into the House at the next session a proposition for the purchase of a part of the White Mountain and southern Appalachian Range and then a suggestion is made for an additional examination and purchase, we would be just where we are now; but we do not know whether this project is to cost \$3,000,000 or \$300,000,000, and now is the time to stop and consider whether or not we will move on without information or by adopting this kind of examination find out just where this project will lead the Government. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which has been reported.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the motion to recede and concur not take priority over the motion of the gentleman from Indiana?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that a motion to recede and concur would take priority, but both motions are divisible, and if the motion was taken first on receding, as it would be, then the motion to amend would have precedence over the motion to concur.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, then if we vote down the motion of the gentleman from Indiana we can move to recede and concur?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. At this stage of the proceedings, the bill having come from the conference committee, has not that motion which has a tendency to bring the two Houses together priority over a motion that has not? Then, if that is the case, at this stage of the proceedings would not the motion to concur have priority over the motion to recede and concur?

The SPEAKER. In the first place, the bill is not in conference. In the second place, under all circumstances a motion to recede and concur is divisible and takes precedence over the motion to disagree. Now, then, the gentleman from Indiana made a motion to recede and concur with an amendment. That is divisible. Now, if that vote on another motion, which would be in order, to recede and concur, is taken and a vote is taken to recede and the House should conclude to recede, why then the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana would be in order before the vote on the motion to concur. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Indiana that the House do recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment that has been reported, say "aye;" those opposed, "no."

The question was taken; and the Chair announced the Chair was in doubt.

On a division (demanded by Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana) there were—ayes 74, noes 105.

Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] will take their places as tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 71, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken.

The Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Division, Mr. Speaker!

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands a division.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 138, nays 115, answered "present" 4, not voting 120, as follows:

## YEAS—138.

Adamson	Foss	Lloyd	Sherley
Aiken	Foster, Vt.	Lovering	Slayden
Allen, Me.	Fowler	McCall	Small
Bankhead	Gardner, Mass.	McNary	Smith, Md.
Bartholdt	Glass	Marshall	Southall
Bell, Ga.	Goldfogle	Maynard	Southard
Bennet, N. Y.	Goulden	Meyer	Sparkman
Bowers	Granger	Moon, Tenn.	Sperry
Brantley	Greene	Mudd	Spight
Brownlow	Gregg	Olcott	Stephens, Tex.
Brundidge	Gronna	Overstreet, Ga.	Sterling
Burleigh	Hale	Padgett	Sullivan
Burnett	Haskins	Page	Suloway
Burton, Del.	Hedlin	Parsons	Sulzer
Calder	Henry, Conn.	Patterson, N. C.	Talbot
Candler	Higgins	Patterson, S. C.	Taylor, Ala.
Capron	Hill, Conn.	Perkins	Thomas, N. C.
Clark, Fla.	Hill, Miss.	Pou	Thomas, Ohio
Clayton	Houston	Powers	Tirrell
Cocks	Hayward	Rainey	Townsend
Cooper, Wis.	Hunt	Randell, Tex.	Trimble
Coudry	Kelther	Reeder	Underwood
Currier	Kitchin, Claude	Reynolds	Wachter
Dale	Kline	Richardson, Ala.	Wadsworth
Davey, La.	Lacey	Riordan	Waldo
Davis, Minn.	Lafean	Roberts	Wallace
Dawes	Lamar	Robinson, Ark.	Washburn
De Armond	Lamb	Rucker	Watkins
Denby	Lawrence	Ruppert	Webb
Dixon, Mont.	Lee	Russell	Weeks
Dunwell	Legare	Ryan	Wiley, Ala.
Edwards	Lever	Saunders	Wiley, N. J.
Ellerbe	Lewis	Scott	Zenor
Finley	Lilley, Conn.	Sheppard	
Flood	Littlefield		

## NAYS—115.

Alexander	Ellis	Knapp	Rodenberg
Andrus	Englebright	Knopf	Samuel
Barchfield	Esch	Landis, Chas. B.	Schneebell
Bartlett	Fassett	Littauer	Shackleford
Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Longworth	Sherman
Birdsall	Fletcher	Loudenslager	Sims
Bishop	Fordney	Lowden	Smith, Cal.
Bonyunge	French	McCreary, Pa.	Smith, Ill.
Brick	Fulkerson	McKinley, Ill.	Smith, Iowa
Brumm	Gardner, Mich.	McKinney	Smith, Ky.
Burke, S. Dak.	Garrett	McMorran	Smith, Mich.
Burton, Ohio	Gilham	Macon	Smith, Pa.
Cassel	Gill	Mahon	Smith, Tex.
Chaney	Gillespie	Mann	Smyser
Chapman	Graff	Martin	Stafford
Clark, Mo.	Graham	Miller	Steenerson
Conner	Grosvenor	Mondell	Stevens, Minn.
Cooper, Pa.	Hamilton	Moore, Pa.	Tawney
Cousins	Hay	Mouser	Taylor, Ohio
Cromer	Hayes	Murdoch	Volstead
Crumacker	Hepburn	Needham	Vreeland
Cushman	Hubbard	Nelson	Wanger
Dalzell	Hull	Norris	Watson
Darragh	Humphrey, Wash.	Olmsted	Weems
Dawson	James	Otjen	Wharton
Deemer	Jones, Wash.	Overstreet, Ind.	Williams
Dickson, Ill.	Kelfer	Parker	Wilson
Dixon, Ind.	Kennedy, Nebr.	Payne	Wood
Driscoll	Kennedy, Ohio	Pollard	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Burgess	Butler, Pa.	Jenkins	Lilley, Pa.
---------	-------------	---------	-------------

## NOT VOTING—120.

Acheson	Davis, W. Va.	Howell, Utah	Morrell
Allen, N. J.	Dovenor	Huff	Murphy
Ames	Draper	Hughes	Nevins
Babcock	Dresser	Humphreys, Miss.	Palmer
Bannon	Dwight	Johnson	Pearre
Bates	Field	Jones, Va.	Prince
Bede	Floyd	Kahn	Pujo
Beidler	Foster, Ind.	Kinkaid	Randsell, La.
Bennett, Ky.	Fuller	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Reid
Bingham	Gaines, Tenn.	Klepper	Rhinock
Blackburn	Gaines, W. Va.	Knowland	Rhodes
Boutell	Garber	Landis, Frederick	Richardson, Ky.
Bowersock	Gardner, N. J.	Law	Rives
Bowie	Garner	Le Fevre	Robertson, La.
Bradley	Gilbert	Lindsay	Scroggy
Brooks, Tex.	Gillet	Livingston	Shartel
Brooks, Colo.	Goebel	Lorimer	Sibley
Broussard	Griggs	Loud	Slomp
Brown	Gudger	McCarthy	Snapp
Buckman	Hardwick	McCleary, Minn.	Southwick
Burke, Pa.	Haugen	McDermott	Stanley
Burleson	Hearst	McGavin	Towne
Butler, Tenn.	Hedge	McKinlay, Cal.	Tyndall
Byrd	Henry, Tex.	McLachlan	Van Duzer
Calderhead	Hermann	McLain	Van Winkle
Campbell, Kans.	Hinshaw	Madden	Webber
Campbell, Ohio	Hogg	Michalek	Weisse
Cockran	Holiday	Minor	Welborn
Cole	Hopkins	Moon, Pa.	Woodyard
Davidson	Howell, N. J.	Moore, Tex.	Young

So the motion was agreed to.



The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:  
Until further notice:

Mr. BANNON with Mr. GARBER.  
Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. BROUSSARD.  
Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania with Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia.  
Mr. BROOKS of Colorado with Mr. PUJO.  
Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.  
Mr. GILLET with Mr. LIVINGSTON.  
Mr. COLE with Mr. GUDGER.  
Mr. DOVENER with Mr. HEARST.  
Mr. PEARRE with Mr. TOWNE.  
For the balance of the day:  
Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. JONES of Virginia.  
Mr. JENKINS with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

For the vote:

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.  
Mr. DRAPER with Mr. BURLESON.  
Mr. GAINES of West Virginia with Mr. SIBLEY.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on amendment No. 88?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement and ask for a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] asks that the House insist on its disagreement to amendment No. 88.

Mr. CLAYTON. Is this amendment No. 88 the one relating to agricultural colleges?

The SPEAKER. The amendment will have to be reported.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment is for aid to the State agricultural colleges.

Amendment No. 88 was read, as follows:

That there shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid as hereinafter provided, to each State and Territory for the more complete endowment and maintenance of agricultural colleges now established, or which may hereafter be established, in accordance with the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, the sum of \$5,000, in addition to the sums named in the said act, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and an annual increase of the amount of such appropriation thereafter for four years by an additional sum of \$5,000 over the preceding year, and the annual sum to be paid thereafter to each State and Territory shall be \$50,000, to be applied only for the purposes of the agricultural colleges as defined and limited in the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890.

That the sum hereby appropriated to the States and Territories for the further endowment and support of the colleges shall be paid by, to, and in the manner prescribed by the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, entitled "An act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862," and the expenditure of the said money shall be governed in all respects by the provisions of the said act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and the said act of Congress approved August 30, 1890: *Provided*, That said colleges may use a portion of this money for providing courses for the special preparation of instructors for teaching the elements of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, which motion takes precedence of the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, how much time have we on that?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York controls the time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. How much time—an hour?

The SPEAKER. The Chair supposes that there could be an hour, but it is now fifteen minutes past 5 o'clock, and many other bills to be acted upon.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that a brief statement from him would be quite sufficient to inform the House as to what this particular Senate amendment is, and that, so far as I am concerned and so far as I am advised on the part of everybody else who is in favor of this Senate amendment, there is no desire for any protracted discussion. It is a simple proposition, Mr. Speaker, to increase the appropriation for the support and maintenance of agricultural and mechanical colleges. I believe, without stopping to read it in extenso, this Senate amendment provides \$5,000 per annum. For how many years?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Five thousand dollars the first year, \$10,000 the second year, \$15,000 the third year, \$20,000 the fourth year, \$25,000 the fifth year, and for every year after that \$25,000 a year.

Mr. CLAYTON. I understand that; and, Mr. Speaker, it is in line with the legislation that has heretofore been passed, beginning with the act of Congress in 1862, for the support and encouragement of agricultural and mechanical colleges and for the teaching of scientific agriculture and of mechanical arts. Now, that is the whole subject. It is for the benefit of agricultural and mechanical colleges. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is all I desire to say.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees refused to agree to that amendment, first, because it was a most important piece of legislation, leading to important results, involving an ultimate expenditure of \$1,150,000 a year, and it had never been considered by the House committee nor by this House and had never been considered by the Senate five minutes. We refused to agree to it also for the reason that there is no State in this Union so poor that it is not able to give to the cause of agriculture anything which that cause may justly ask of her.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WADSWORTH. What does the gentleman desire?

Mr. CLAYTON. I wanted to ask the gentleman in reply to his first suggestion whether the House committee had not considered this matter, and I doubt not that is true—

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is true.

Mr. CLAYTON. Has not considered it at this session, but has not the Committee on Agriculture repeatedly at former sessions of Congress considered this very appropriation named here in this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Never to my knowledge, and I have been chairman of the committee twelve years.

Mr. CLAYTON. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, I do not know and do not recall now what committee it was or whether the gentleman was present; but I recollect distinctly that some committee of this House several Congresses ago did have hearings on this very matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That may be so, but it was not the Committee on Agriculture during the last twelve years.

Mr. LACEY. There were hearings in the Committee on Public Lands a number of years ago on this question.

Mr. CLAYTON. The hearing was before the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is another proposition entirely. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, there is no State in this Union so poor that she can not give to the cause of agriculture any sum that it needs. The original appropriation in 1862 was made when there were a great many new Territories and new States. They were not rich; they had not developed their taxable property, and perhaps in those days it was a sensible proposition.

Mr. TAWNEY. How much are we appropriating to agricultural colleges?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We are already appropriating to agricultural colleges \$25,000, and this seeks to add \$5,000 a year to that sum, until the total reaches \$50,000 a year. To my mind there is a more serious opposition to this bill than that. Mr. Speaker, it opens the widest door toward centralization of power in the Federal Government. It is the longest step toward centralization that this House has ever taken.

Let me show you how easy the steps are. Last year we passed the Adams bill, so called, giving \$15,000 a year for the experimental stations. I said then I was opposed to it, and that I thought every State ought to take care of its own. Now, the next thing in the programme will be \$15,000 or \$25,000 for agricultural colleges. And the step, as you see, has come. Now, let me show you the bills that are pending along this line now before the Committee on Agriculture: "To apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the State normal schools." Now, there are twice as many State normal schools as there are agricultural colleges, and twice as many votes behind them to pass that measure in this House. Another is this bill in question. Another is "For the maintenance of agricultural colleges in Congressional districts;" another, "To provide"—listen—"To provide an annual appropriation for industrial education in agricultural high schools and in city high schools;" another, "To provide for an annual appropriation for branch agricultural and branch experimental stations, and regulate the expenditure thereof."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the next step will be the public schools; and there you have Federal governmental supervision of your school systems and Federal governmental control of your education. That is the basis of my great opposition to it, and I beg this House not to take this step; at least let it go over and be considered on its merits and not jam it through here on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CLAYTON. Will the gentleman give me a few minutes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. With pleasure. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I did not in the beginning desire or intend to indulge in very extensive remarks, but I do desire to reply briefly to some of the observations just delivered by the gentleman from New York. First, as to his suggestion that this matter has not been properly considered, I desire to say that it has been considered in former Congresses; that it has been discussed in the public prints; that every Member in this House—it may be with the exception of those Members from cities—certainly all the Members of the great country districts, have had this matter under consideration and have had it called to their attention. So much for the "surprise;" that this legislation is by way of "surprise," and that we do not know what we are about to do.

Mr. Speaker, we know what we want to do and when we want to do it, and we propose to pass this measure now in order that poor boys may have the full benefit of a good education in scientific agriculture and the most useful and common mechanical arts.

We have been deliberating upon it, we have been considering it, and this House understands the proposition now as well as if we were to discuss it and consider it again and again during forty Congresses. We are going to have this legislation now. I appeal to the Members from the farming districts to stand with me.

Before going further, I desire to say that the gentleman from Iowa has just called my attention to what occurred in a former Congress. This matter was considered by the Committee on Agriculture—this specific proposition. Since that time—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LACEY. By the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh!

Mr. CLAYTON. I beg your pardon. The Committee on Public Lands considered this very measure. It was not brought before Congress; why, I do not know. The only difference between that measure and this measure is that the proposition when it was pending before the Committee on Public Lands, provided that the funds should come out of the sale of the public lands. Since that time the legislation of Congress has exhausted the money arising from the sale of public lands by devoting it to irrigation purposes.

Now, then, as to the other proposition, of centralization—that this is a great scheme of centralizing the Government. Well, now, nobody is afraid that the Government is going to be ruined and centralized on account of this small contribution to the agricultural and mechanical colleges of the country.

It is too late to discuss this policy of legislation. It was begun in 1862, this very sort of legislation, and it is strictly in line with the policy of that legislation that this present measure is ordered. The agricultural and mechanical colleges that have been aided by appropriations of Congress since the act of 1862 and the other act of 1890 have never in the slightest degree fallen under Federal control. So that imaginary danger suggested by the gentleman from New York can not frighten us.

The gentleman from New York tries further to make it appear that it is a frightful proposition, that a large number of bills of different characters that he referred to might be considered by the House. No good lawyer would and no good legislator ought to depart from the discussion of a pending case or pending measure by going off to try an imaginary case or a measure that is not before the court or legislature. Let us consider this measure that is before us, and on its merits. We do not hesitate to give money to Annapolis or West Point. We do not hesitate to give money for our consular service. We do not hesitate to encourage the commerce of our country, and let us in this small way encourage agriculture as we have commerce, her handmaiden. [Applause.]

Mr. KEIFER. I should like to ascertain whether this provision does not give to every college, regardless of its size, the same sum of money. I understand that to be the fact, and I wish to state that that was not the provision of the act of 1862 establishing these colleges.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this proposition involved in the Senate amendment, it is that ultimately, under the legislation now upon the statute books and under the legislation that it is proposed by this amendment to write into the statute books, the Government of the United States will in four years be contributing annually to the agricultural colleges and experimental stations \$80,000 each per annum. Now, Mr. Speaker, the House, in concurring in the amendment a few moments ago authorizing the survey of the Appalachian Forest

Reserve, has opened the way for the expenditure in the next few years of \$200,000,000 in the purchase of the worthless land it is proposed to buy from individuals and the States for forestry purposes. I want to call attention to the fact that in the next fiscal year we perhaps will have to meet out of the current revenue of the Government a larger expenditure, authorized by this Congress, than we have ever before made in any year in the history of our Republic. Notwithstanding this fact, the Senate sends us this amendment, thus largely increasing the amount to be donated to the State agricultural colleges. Is there no limit, Mr. Speaker, to the extravagance of this Congress? During this session of Congress the Senate has increased the appropriations carried in the bills sent to that body by the enormous amount of \$51,000,000. Fifty-one million dollars is the gross increase of the regular appropriation bills by the Senate above the amount these bills carried when they left the House. Eight millions of that is accounted for on account of the service-pension bill, \$6,000,000 of it on account of the Coast Artillery bill, for which the House must share the responsibility with the Senate, leaving a net increase on the part of the Senate over the appropriations as they passed the House of \$35,000,000, a larger increase than has ever been made by the other House of Congress for a great many years, if not in the entire history of this country.

I therefore submit, in view of these enormous increases, that we should stop and consider whether or not we can afford to thus legislate on an appropriation bill, without opportunity for considering the merits of the proposed legislation and without time to consider whether the Federal Treasury will be able to stand the increased expenditure made necessary by appropriating this increased amount to every State and Territorial agricultural college in the country. True, the amount is only \$80,000 to each college, but that amount will be added to hereafter if this policy is continued, as is evidenced by the bills that are now pending before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I should like to ask the gentleman if this amount is not more urgently needed in the improvement of State roads?

Mr. TAWNEY. No doubt this amount would serve a better purpose in some respects if used in the improvement of our roads, but it would be hard for the gentleman from Ohio to convince his rural constituents of that fact. Pressure upon Congress for the passage of a good-roads bill is growing all the time, and if we continue this policy of paternalism much further it will not be long until Congress will be swept off its feet and called upon to appropriate from \$25,000,000 to \$50,000,000 annually for the construction and maintenance of good roads. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House will stop and consider the extent to which we are going in this session of Congress in the appropriation of the public funds for objects that are not governmental, but purely paternal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would \$80,000 a year be sufficient to support an agricultural college without any aid from the State whatever?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not know whether \$80,000 would be sufficient, but in view of the fact that it is not a part of the business of the Federal Government to maintain these local institutions, \$80,000 is more than we ought to contribute for that purpose. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, if the House will give me its attention for a few moments I will, in a concise form, give what I understand to be the present situation. In 1862 the Congress passed what is known as the "Morrill Act." That act gave an endowment for the benefit of agricultural colleges and mechanic arts schools certain donations of land, and the States were authorized under that act to select these lands, sell them at the price then authorized, and out of the proceeds to form a permanent endowment fund for inaugurating and perpetuating the agricultural and mechanic arts colleges. Supplemental to that act the second Morrill Act, in 1890, was passed, which gave to each State having an agricultural college therein established the sum of \$25,000 annually.

Now, at the time the first Morrill Act was passed there was no such thing as a manual training school, a mechanic arts school, an industrial school, or an agricultural college. The impetus given to that branch of education by this donation was very marked. It produced an effect like that produced upon our public schools when the Government donated and appropriated large tracts of the public domain in their behalf. Our common schools, which are our pride are largely the product of Federal aid. Call it paternalism, call it centralization of power, but such is the case with the present common school system, and who objects to it? In consequence of these two public acts, what has been the result? At the present time



It has incited every State government to invest, and they have invested in lands and buildings for agricultural colleges and mechanic arts schools the enormous sum of \$45,834,731, making an average for each State of \$954,000.

At the present time the annual appropriations by the Government for the maintenance of all these schools is less than \$2,000,000. Of the total expenses of maintaining this splendid system of education, 83 per cent thereof is borne by the respective States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word as to centralization. I do not agree that this provision, or any other of a similar kind, means in the least centralization of power. Centralization of power does not mean to build up and make strong an individual State. The individual State is a unit, and the more powerful you make the individual State, the more independent it becomes; and the greatest power you can give the individual State is to aid it and to educate it along the lines of industrial arts and agriculture. This amendment means decentralization in every line and every word.

The family unit is strongest when each of its members are individually strong. The State is most powerful when all of its peoples are social, moral, and intellectual giants, and the Federal Government is all powerful only when each and all of the States and Territories constituting it have attained a degree of great solidarity; call it what you may, "paternalism" or "centralization of Federal powers," yet to my mind the education obtained by and through colleges of agriculture or mechanic arts strengthens and develops not only the Government, but all and each of its constituent parts, and hence fails to be obnoxious.

During the year 1905 the total income from all sources for all of these colleges was \$9,748,702, 83 per cent of which was furnished by the respective States and the balance by the Federal Government. This showing indicates the great strides that have been made in this line of education since the endowment of these colleges under the Morrill Act of 1862.

The amendment placed upon this bill by the Senate, and which I earnestly hope will be concurred in by the House, provides for an annual increase of appropriations for these colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts in the sum of \$5,000 for each State and Territory in which one or more of these colleges are established and maintained, and a like increase of \$5,000 for four additional years thereafter, thus making \$25,000 for each State and Territory, so that ultimately the Federal Government will contribute to the States and Territories \$50,000 annually for the encouragement and maintenance of these institutions of learning.

The amendment further provides that a portion of this may be used for providing courses for the special preparation of instructors for teaching the elements of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Statistics show that of the many thousand students now being instructed in these colleges the line of their instruction is as follows: Fully one-half thereof are pursuing a practical course of study in all the various branches of mechanic arts; and of the remainder, about two-thirds are being educated along agricultural lines and one-third in home economics.

This new education, while retaining the high moral and ethical ideals of the old, combines with these substantial training in doing the thing of everyday life. This broader field of public education is now suited to the needs alike of workers, business men, home makers, technicians, and professionals. It trains to think by thinking. It trains to do by doing. And Congress can not do too much to help the States in completing this broadest kind of public education.

These land-grant colleges have influenced the nonagricultural industries to nearly as great a degree as they have improved agriculture.

The engineering courses in these colleges have supplied a large share of the men to develop our vast systems of transportation and manufacturing.

The people are generally awakening to the value of educating the boy and girl along these lines who are to remain on our farms. They are being educated, as it were, closer to the soil, for in its last analysis productive land is the basis of our greatest and lasting prosperity.

We are nearing the 90,000,000 population mark, and about one-third of whom are of school age. Therefore let us be wise in time and educate these young men and women in a way that they will not only be self-supporting and wholly independent, but that they may by their knowledge and habits of industry contribute more surely to the welfare, happiness, and prosperity of our already great but constantly increasing civilization, ever remembering that education ought not to be, and

is not, a burden upon civilization, but that education is strong and bears upon its shoulders civilization itself. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the original act by which the agricultural colleges were established is of course conceded. It might indeed be called an epoch-making measure, because it began a new policy on the part of the Federal Government. It was a measure of so great importance and ran so far contrary to the policies that had theretofore been followed that the preceding President, James Buchanan, vetoed a similar, if not exactly the same, measure during his Administration. He vetoed it on the ground that it was an unwarranted, unconstitutional expenditure of Government funds to be expended in education wholly within the State.

Here we have a measure brought in in the closing hours of this session almost as important as this original act, because it doubles the appropriation which the original acts carried, brought in here without any consideration by any committee in this House, without any consideration on the floor of the Senate, and in such a shape that if it had been brought here originally it could have been stricken from the bill on a point of order. It seems to me, therefore, that the action of your conferees in refusing to concur was fully warranted in the interest of orderly and regular parliamentary procedure. But passing by for a moment the irregular way in which the measure comes before us. I most earnestly believe that the House ought to stand by its conferees on the merits or, I should say, the demerits of the measure. I want to call the attention of Members of this House to the fact that the Government of the United States is already paying to each of these agricultural colleges \$25,000 a year under the Morrill Act, \$15,000 a year under the Hatch Act, and when the Adams Act matures we will be paying \$15,000 more a year, a total of \$55,000 a year, which goes to these agricultural colleges and experiment stations in every State and Territory of the Union. If this act should become a law when it reaches maturity, we will then be paying \$80,000 a year to every State and Territory, and that would make an annual appropriation for that purpose of \$3,840,000. It seems to me preposterous that the States should come to the Congress after having been so generously treated and demand still further grants. I know that in the State which I have the honor to represent here we have a splendid agricultural college, and I am not saying a word against the policy, because I approve of it. We have a splendid agricultural college, and I want to say to the credit of the man who presides with honor over that institution that he has not asked the Representatives here from Kansas to support this measure, because he knows that that State can provide for itself.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, how much are these strictly agricultural colleges? Is it not a fact that by no means the larger proportion of students actually follow the profession of agriculture, and that to a large extent they are mostly colleges for general education for those entering all ranks of life?

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman from New York has called the attention of the House to a very important fact, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the agricultural colleges carry general courses of instruction and do not by any means limit their work to education in agriculture—another reason why this additional grant should not be made. But I was going on to say that if any of these colleges need more money than they are getting from the Government, there is no Commonwealth in this nation that is not amply able to supply that money. I may be pardoned if I make reference to a personal experience. As a member of our own State legislature, when bills came before the committee of which I was a member making appropriations for the various educational institutions of the State, we took judicial notice of the fact that the agricultural college was getting \$40,000 a year, as it was at that time, from the Government, and we cut the appropriation from the State treasury by just that amount. If we pass this measure, it simply means that when the next legislature meets the amount of money to be appropriated from the State treasury will be reduced by just the amount this bill carries. And what is true in Kansas will be true in all the other States and Territories. The passage of this bill will not result in a single additional dollar being spent for agricultural education. It will simply mean that the money shall be taken from the national and not from the State treasuries.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Speaker, I shall not occupy much time, but I feel like calling the attention of the House to the

fact that this is not a departure from the methods that have been hitherto followed, and in answer to the statement of the gentleman that this is a question that has never been properly considered, I desire to inform the House that a printed document of the Senate entitled "Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry" is in evidence before us, and to further inform the gentleman of the fact that beginning at about page 58 and concluding with page 86 there is evidence on this particular subject taken before the Committee on Agriculture in January and in the first days of February of this year. I think some of the most distinguished gentlemen that have been before any committee appeared before the committee at that time and made statements as to the necessity of this particular legislation.

It is not true that this legislation is intended for State purposes alone. The original idea which was maintained in 1862 and which was again brought to the attention of the Congress in 1890 fairly illustrated the fact that if this Government was to aid in any particular department of the public life, it could bring the most benefit through aid along the lines of our agricultural schools. One gentleman has suggested that a majority of the boys who graduate from our agricultural colleges do not follow the profession of farming (I think it is a profession at this time); but the fact of the matter is that there is scarcely a boy who goes out from our agricultural schools who does not make life mean more, who does not contribute perhaps more to the general benefit of the whole people, than is done by the graduate of almost any other college. This provision is made for the purpose of enlarging the possibilities of the work of these schools, and it is interstate. There can be no question about that. There is coming to be a common system of agricultural schools throughout the United States, and the professors in one school visit and lecture to the students in other schools. So I say that there is a fairly uniform system all through the United States. We have here in this House contributed thousands of dollars of the public money for the purpose of investigating fuels, for the purpose of investigating our geological conditions, and yet I submit that there is no money that could be expended in a more generally useful way, in a way that reaches the people more directly, that more forcibly appeals to the higher manhood and to better civilization, than this particular appropriation. [Applause.] And it is supported, I repeat, by the very best men who have appeared before any committee—men who have devoted their lives to this particular work.

I do not care to occupy any further time, although it is a most fruitful subject for discussion. Let us consider for a moment the higher principles of our civilization, and not devote ourselves always to the lower elements. We have a school in Michigan that turns out boys which reflect credit on all of the United States. It is the first of its kind in the United States. It is an inspiration for others to follow. Let us say by our vote that manhood is not at a discount in comparison with coal or gold. Can this House afford to subsidize steamship companies, develop water courses, test coal, and then refuse to aid in extending knowledge and developing manhood? I can not believe it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I regret to differ with my honored colleague, but I would like to have him and the House notice a few figures. We are now, if this measure passes, contracting to give \$80,000 a year in perpetuity to fifty institutions, State and Territorial. What does that mean to each college? It means a sum equal to \$2,000,000 every year at 4 per cent per annum to every institution. At 4 per cent that means an accrued income at the end of twenty years of \$1,600,000 to the agricultural college of the State of Michigan and every other like institution.

It means the drying up of private benevolence and that our States will withhold the hand that gives to our agricultural colleges because the General Government gives so liberally. I speak for the State of Michigan when I say I believe her great commonalty do not ask it. She is rich in agriculture, rich in mines, rich in all the elements of wealth, and she does not ask the Government to give this perpetual endowment, which would annually employ forty professors at \$2,000 each. The Michigan Agricultural College is the oldest, the most renowned, and one of the best endowed in the country. The President of the United States comes to us on the 31st of May to celebrate our semicentennial as the mother of all the agricultural colleges in the United States.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Let me interrupt the gentleman. I want

to remind the gentleman that before Members of this House and before Members of the Senate the president of the agricultural college in Michigan did insist that this should be granted. I know of no way of voicing the sentiment of Michigan except through its authorized agent. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. And there is no institution in the country that will not do the same. There is not a State that has not an agricultural college, and there is not a Territory that has not an agricultural college now that will not have one in twelve months and come here asking for \$80,000 to sustain it. I hope, gentlemen, you will not embark upon this undertaking without ample consideration and discussion. This is far-reaching in extent. The gentleman from Michigan talks about the benefit to men living upon the farm. A former president of the Michigan Agricultural College states that very few of her graduates are practical agriculturalists—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sincerely in favor of concurring in the Senate amendment. [Applause.] I do not regard this bill as showing any predilection toward paternalism. If it is, then paternalism with regard to the matter of education has been a favored method of procedure of the Government of the United States. The very first of the new States carved out of the Northwest Territory coming into the Union received a sixteenth section of land in each township for educational purposes. Every other State, from 1803 down to about 1860, received a sixteenth section of land for educational purposes. Then came a new policy and the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections of land were granted to all of the new States, and to some a very much larger portion of the public domain was given.

There has been no equality in the distribution of the public lands, but very great inequality. The old States not only secured all of the land within their borders, but Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, and others of the old States received large grants in the Northwest Territory. Now, this is in the direction of absolute equality to all the States. Heretofore the legislation has not been of that character. The original grant made to establish agricultural colleges in 1862 was 30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative in the delegation of the State. Under that legislation the State of New York, without an acre of public lands within her borders, received about 900,000 acres. She received it in scrip, and scrip that very shortly became very much more valuable than the dollar and a quarter an acre, the money value that that act of Congress gave to this donation. Practically it was money to the old States rather than land.

Now, this bill in its operation is uniform. It operates upon all the States alike. It will be remembered that some of the States by the act of 1862 were debarred from participating in its benefits. Whether that has been remedied to the full since then I am not prepared to say, but some of them at least are compelled to take an inferior quality of land that did not bring to them the large sums that some other of the States got. This bill, however, is equal in its benefits to all, and I for one am not deterred by the fear that this is paternalism. I am not deterred by the extravagant figures of my friend, the \$40,000,000 that are to be given to his State, which he will upon reflection conclude was an effort to draw upon his imagination. No such sums as those come from the Treasury of the United States. He talks about income rather than capital.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Does the gentleman deny the accuracy of the figures?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not deny the accuracy of the figures, but the gentleman has multiplied, in showing the enormosity of this grant, the actual outlay of the Government some twenty or twenty-five times.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Does not the gentleman know that every college in the land creates its income in that way?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

Mr. KEIFER. The gentleman who has just taken his seat has fallen into some confusion about equality. He has forgotten that the original act of 1862 gave a certain number of acres of land or scrip to each Congressional district, and that in that way we had in the larger States the larger amount of land or scrip. He has also forgotten that States that had no land subject to be taken up got only scrip and could not enter land with it in the name of the State unless on land within the State. He has forgotten that in the States having no land subject to entry they generally sold their scrip for 50 cents an acre. I bought some of it myself, and I know. The only State that I can now



recall that violated that was the State of New York. That State had its scrip taken by Mr. Cornell, who went to Wisconsin and, perhaps, to other States and Territories and there entered it in his own name and afterwards sold it and gave the proceeds of the sale to the State of New York, and therefore New York called her agricultural college "Cornell." That is the way it worked in that State. And now it is not proposed to equalize this matter of donation and to carry it on from year to year, but it is proposed to give to each agricultural college in each State, and to each little agricultural college as much as the greater ones. If this is equity, I do not understand it. That is the reason, no doubt, that it has friends all around here, but if we are going to do equity we should give in proportion to numbers in each State, in proportion to students in the colleges. You ought to do it by following the same general principle and rule established in the original act of 1862, which laid the foundation for all these colleges. That act only intended to endow, through the public lands, these agricultural institutions, and it did not contemplate the carrying on of those institutions, and it devolved on the States to carry them on, as has been done ever since.

[Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to recede from the disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CLAYTON. Division!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 100, yeas 92.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the gentleman from New York that we take a recess from now until 8 o'clock, and at 8 o'clock have the yeas and nays.

Mr. PAYNE. Regular order!

Mr. WILLIAMS. That destroys the recess, and you will have to be here all night.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 120, yeas 87, answered "present" 4, not voting 166, as follows:

#### YEAS—120.

Adamson	Darragh	Hull	Robinson, Ark.
Aiken	Davis, Minn.	Humphreys, Miss.	Russell
Allen, Me.	Dawes	Kline	Samuel
Bankhead	Deemer	Lafean	Saunders
Beall, Tex.	Dickson, Ill.	Lamar	Sheppard
Bell, Ga.	Dixon, Ind.	Lee	Small
Bennet, N. Y.	Dixon, Mont.	Legare	Smith, Md.
Birdsall	Dunwell	Lewis	Smith, Mich.
Bonyng	Ellerbe	Littlefield	Smith, Pa.
Bowers	Finley	Lowden	Southall
Brantley	Flood	McKinney	Sparkman
Buckman	Foster, Vt.	McMorran	Sperry
Burleigh	Fowler	Macon	Steenerson
Burnett	French	Mahon	Stevens, Minn.
Burton, Del.	Gill	Maynard	Sulloway
Butler, Pa.	Glass	Moon, Tenn.	Talbott
Calderhead	Gregg	Mudd	Taylor, Ala.
Candler	Grosvenor	Murphy	Taylor, Ohio
Capron	Hale	Nelson	Thomas, N. C.
Cassel	Hamilton	Olmsted	Townsend
Chaney	Haskins	Overstreet, Ga.	Trimble
Chapman	Hay	Page	Underwood
Clark, Fla.	Hefflin	Patterson, N. C.	Wallace
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Conn.	Patterson, S. C.	Watkins
Clayton	Hepburn	Pearre	Webb
Conner	Higgins	Pou	Wiley, Ala.
Cooper, Wis.	Hill, Miss.	Powers	Wiley, N. J.
Cousins	Houston	Rainey	Williams
Crumpacker	Howard	Randell, Tex.	Wood
Currier	Hubbard	Reynolds	Zenor

#### NAYS—87.

Allen, N. J.	Garrett	Longworth	Riordan
Andrus	Gilham	Lorimer	Ryan
Babcock	Gillespie	Loudenslager	Scott
Barchfeld	Goldfogle	Lovering	Sherley
Bartholdt	Graff	McCreary, Pa.	Smith, Cal.
Bates	Graham	McNary	Smith, Iowa
Brick	Granger	Mann	Smyser
Brumm	Greene	Miller	Southard
Burton, Ohio	Hayes	Mondell	Stafford
Cocks	Hill, Conn.	Mouser	Sterling
Cromer	Hinshaw	Murdock	Sullivan
Cushman	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham	Tawney
Dalzell	James	Olcott	Tirrell
Denby	Jones, Wash.	Otjen	Vreeland
Driscoll	Keller	Overstreet, Ind.	Wachter
Englebright	Kennedy, Nebr.	Parker	Wadsworth
Esch	Kennedy, Ohio	Parsons	Waldo
Fassett	Knopf	Payne	Wanger
Fitzgerald	Lacey	Perkins	Weems
Gardner, Mass.	Lamb	Pollard	Wharton
Gardner, Mich.	Lawrence	Reeder	Wilson
Gardner, N. J.	Littauer	Reynolds	

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Jenkins	Norris	Shackleford	Sherman
NOT VOTING—166.			

Acheson	Dresser	Kitchin, Claude	Rhinock
Alexander	Dwight	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rhodes
Ames	Edwards	Klepper	Richardson, Ala.
Bannon	Ellis	Knapp	Richardson, Ky.
Bartlett	Field	Knowland	Rives
Bede	Fletcher	Landis, Chas. B.	Roberts
Beidler	Floyd	Landis, Frederick	Robertson, La.
Bennett, Ky.	Fordney	Law	Rodenberg
Bingham	Foss	Le Fevre	Rucker
Bishop	Foster, Ind.	Lever	Ruppert
Blackburn	Fulkerson	Lilley, Conn.	Schneebell
Boutell	Fuller	Lilley, Pa.	Scroggy
Bowersock	Gaines, Tenn.	Lindsay	Shartel
Bowie	Gaines, W. Va.	Livingston	Sibley
Bradley	Garber	Lloyd	Sims
Brooks, Tex.	Garner	Loud	Slayden
Brooks, Colo.	Gilbert	McCall	Slemp
Broussard	Gillet	McCarthy	Smith, Ill.
Brown	Goebel	McCleary, Minn.	Smith, Ky.
Brownlow	Goulden	McDermott	Smith, Tex.
Brundidge	Griggs	McGavin	Snapp
Burgess	Gronna	McKinlay, Cal.	Southwick
Burke, Pa.	Gudger	McKinley, Ill.	Spight
Burke, S. Dak.	Hardwick	McLachlan	Stanley
Burleson	Haugen	McLain	Stephens, Tex.
Butler, Tenn.	Hearst	Madden	Sulzer
Byrd	Hedge	Marshall	Thomas, Ohio
Calder	Henry, Tex.	Martin	Towne
Campbell, Kans.	Hermann	Meyer	Tyndall
Campbell, Ohio	Hogg	Michalek	Van Duzer
Cockran	Holliday	Minor	Van Winkle
Cole	Hopkins	Moon, Pa.	Volstead
Cooper, Pa.	Howell, N. J.	Moore, Pa.	Washburn
Coudry	Howell, Utah	Moore, Tex.	Watson
Dale	Huff	Morrell	Webber
Davey, La.	Hughes	Nevins	Weeks
Davidson	Hunt	Padgett	Weisse
Davis, W. Va.	Johnson	Palmer	Welborn
Dawson	Jones, Va.	Prince	Woodyard
De Armond	Kahn	Pujo	Young
Dovenor	Kelher	Ransdell, La.	
Draper	Kinkaid	Reid	

So the motion to recede and concur was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

For this session:

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. MEYER.

Until further notice:

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

On this vote:

Mr. ELLIS (against) with Mr. PADGETT (in favor).

Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. LEVER (against college).

Mr. NORRIS (favor receding) with Mr. ROBERTS (against receding).

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Mr. KINKAID with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. BEDE with Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.

Mr. SIBLEY with Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.

Mr. GOEBEL with Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. SNAPP with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. DRAPER with Mr. BURLESON.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. DE ARMOND.

Mr. GARNER (in favor) with Mr. KELIHER (against agricultural college).

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania with Mr. HUNT.

Mr. DAWSON with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. THOMAS of Ohio with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. KNAPP with Mr. TOWNE.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. CLAYTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the House receded from its disagreement and concurred in the Senate amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a bill and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13671) to provide for the taking of a census of agriculture in the year 1906 and every tenth year after the year 1905.

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the census now required by law to be taken every ten years, there shall be taken in the year 1906 and every tenth year after the year 1905 a census of agriculture, which shall show:

First. A classified census of live stock, with their values.

Second. The acreage of the principal crops, including cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and oats, grown in the United States.

Sec. 2. That the Director of the Census is hereby authorized and required to prepare such schedules and to make such rules and regulations and to submit such estimates as may be necessary to carry this act into effect. And he may utilize the services of rural free-delivery carriers wherever practicable in distributing and collecting schedules along the routes of such carriers, who will perform this service without additional compensation: *Provided*, That for the purpose of securing the statistics required by this act the Director of the Census may select and appoint special agents when necessary, and such special agents shall receive compensation at rates not to exceed \$4 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses and an allowance in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$2 per day during their necessary absence from their usual place of residence: *And provided further*, That said special agents shall be residents of the counties where they are to be employed.

Sec. 3. That the Director of the Census is hereby prohibited from publishing any statistical data gathered under the provisions of this act containing an element of estimation, but he shall only cause to be announced actual facts ascertained to exist through careful canvass and enumeration.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, more than three years ago I introduced a bill embodying substantially the same provisions contained in this bill. I did so after consultation with the representatives of many agricultural associations and at the instance of the late secretary of the National Live Stock Association of America, who urged the importance of a more frequent enumeration of live stock. At that time the purpose of the bill was indorsed by the National Board of Trade. Shortly before then a committee had been appointed, representing the various commercial organizations of our country, to investigate agricultural statistics as disclosed by the last census, and this committee, consisting of a member of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, the New York Produce Exchange, the Chicago Board of Trade, the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, and the National Board of Trade unanimously reported in favor of "a census report every five years, especially for agricultural data which form a basis for calculations of estimates and of area and production by other official service, governmental and otherwise, as to the more prominent crops and as to the number of farm animals." Since introduction this bill has likewise been indorsed by a number of agricultural societies and farmers' institutes and associations throughout the Southern States.

The purpose of the measure is first to obtain a quinquennial census of the live stock of the country. The necessity and importance of this is readily and naturally suggested to the mind of every thoughtful person. A second purpose is to obtain a quinquennial census of the acreage planted to the more important crops like cotton and wheat, for the purpose of furnishing the Bureau of Statistics of the Agricultural Department more frequent standards, in order to enable it more accurately to prepare its annual estimate of these crops.

Mr. Speaker, the annual estimate of live stock issued by the Agricultural Department largely depends for its accuracy upon a base line of established fact. This base line is furnished every ten years by the national census. It is believed by those most competent to judge that there should be furnished to the scientific statisticians who make these estimates a more frequent standard. Believing this, the cattle growers of the Northwest and the Southwest have been for many years persistently urging the necessity of a quinquennial census of live stock. They say that the period of time between each decennial census is so long that they become uncertain whether or not the annual estimate furnished by the Agricultural Department is sufficiently accurate to enable them to determine the real value of their stock.

If error should creep into the annual estimates of live stock made by the Agricultural Department, one can readily understand that the error might become more hurtful year by year as we get away from the standard which is furnished by each decennial census, and this error might not be corrected until the next decennial period was reached. You can easily understand what great damage might be done our live-stock interests, especially when it is remembered that we annually export approximately a quarter of a billion dollars of live stock and meat products. Furthermore, a material change in the market price of live stock frequently results in a decrease of the output for several years following this change of price. I will illustrate what I mean: Suppose there is a marked advance in the price being paid for cattle in Fort Worth, Chicago, Kansas City, or St. Louis. It frequently results in many female cattle being disposed of, and in consequence of this fact there is for several years a smaller increase in the number of cattle. Or, on the contrary, as has happened, if cattle sell for a number of years at a very low price, the stock raiser is not encouraged to enlarge his herd, but, on the contrary, reduces the number of his female cattle, which is followed, of course, by a decrease in the annual output of cattle. These conditions can only be

known to the parties at interest through the instrumentality of the Department of Agriculture when it announces its annual estimate of live stock, and any action we can take to make these estimates more accurate is, of course, of the greatest importance. All stock growers thoroughly understand this.

The purpose of this bill has therefore been indorsed by the National Live Stock Association of America and by the Texas Cattle Growers' Association. Mr. Martin, late secretary of the National Live Stock Association, made a trip from Denver to Washington for the purpose of setting this measure on foot, having been directed to do so by the membership of that organization.

Mr. Speaker, the knowledge of the number of stock raised in the country has not only a very material effect upon the value of the stock, but if the fact is made known (through the annual estimates) that the number of cattle or hogs has for any reason decreased or increased it enables the grower to determine the correct line of policy to adopt—whether to sell or to hold; whether to prepare to increase or diminish the number he is growing.

The principal difficulty besetting the statistician in making the annual estimate of live stock has been the marked changes in conditions occasioned by the extraordinary development of the southwestern and northwestern sections of our country.

These varying conditions have brought about many radical changes, especially with regard to domestic animals, which the system of the Department has found it difficult to meet as time has elapsed after each census. The transference of stock raising from range to farms, the multiplication of farms upon hitherto public land, the expansion of dairying, the feeding of beef animals, the breeding of horses, and the shifting of sheep-growing areas—all these have presented difficulties with which no system short of a census enumeration could cope during years far subsequent to a census. If this country had such constant and stable agricultural conditions as are found in Great Britain, Germany, or France, perhaps the crop-reporting system, outside of census enumeration, might be trusted to work along upon this census base line for a period of ten years, since it would find no place where it would be balked by radical and momentous changes in agriculture and stock raising; but in this country, where such changes are constantly going on, the country certainly needs to give to the Department of Agriculture a more frequent base line than one every ten years with respect to the principal crops and domestic animals.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to impress on the House the importance of the special agricultural census under discussion, and I ask consideration of two or three commodities or groups of commodities. Take the *live stock on farms and ranges*. They have increased to vast numbers, and in the aggregate amounted to 204,000,000 on January 1, 1907, at a time when the number of sheep and of swine is from 15 to 20 per cent below the number in early summer.

The value of live stock on farms and ranges in the United States was ascertained by the Department of Agriculture to be \$4,424,000,000 on January 1, 1907. The increase in the number of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of this country for a period of sixty-seven years is exhibited in certain tables which I will embody in my remarks.

TABLE A.—Number of domestic animals on farms and ranges June 1, as ascertained by census enumerators in contiguous United States, 1840-1900.

[Not including calves, colts, and lambs under 1 year.]

Census of June 1—	Cattle.			Horses.	Mules. <sup>a</sup>	Sheep.	Swine.
	Total.	Dairy cows.	Other cattle.				
	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.
1840..	14,971,586						
1850..	17,778,907	6,385,094	11,393,813	64,336,719	6559,331	19,311,374	26,301,293
1860..	225,620,019	8,585,735	217,034,284	66,249,174	61,151,148	22,471,275	633,512,867
1870..	223,820,608	8,935,332	214,885,276	67,145,370	61,125,415	28,477,951	625,134,569
1880..	39,675,533	12,443,120	27,232,413	10,357,488	61,812,808	42,192,074	49,772,670
1890..	57,648,792	16,511,950	41,136,842	15,266,244	62,251,876	40,876,312	57,426,859
1900 <sup>d</sup>	52,403,828	17,135,633	35,268,195	16,952,191	3,032,987	39,852,967	62,868,041

<sup>a</sup> Prior to 1890 asses and burros were enumerated with mules.

<sup>b</sup> No separate report or estimate of range animals.

<sup>c</sup> Including estimated number of range animals separately reported.

<sup>d</sup> For purposes of comparison spring calves, colts, and lambs are not included in the total numbers of neat cattle, horses and mules, and sheep, respectively, for 1900. In 1850 they were excluded from reports by instructions to enumerators. For other census years no instructions were given concerning them. It is probable that a few, but not all, were reported.



TABLE B.—Total value of domestic animals, 1900 and 1907, in contiguous United States.  
[Including calves, colts, and lambs under 1 year.]

Date.	Total.	Cattle.		
		Total.	Dairy cows.	Other cattle.
CENSUS.				
1900, June 1:				
On farms and ranges.....	\$2,970,121,053	\$1,475,204,633	\$508,616,501	\$966,588,132
Off farms and ranges.....	213,556,356	41,102,637	28,879,619	12,223,018
Total.....	3,183,677,409	1,516,307,270	537,496,120	978,811,150
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.				
1907, January 1:				
On farms and ranges.....	4,423,697,000	1,527,054,000	645,497,000	881,557,000
Date.	Horses.	Mules.	Sheep.	Swine.
CENSUS.				
1900, June 1:				
On farms and ranges.....	\$896,513,217	\$196,222,053	\$170,203,119	\$231,978,031
Off farms and ranges.....	154,013,750	11,052,504	678,624	6,708,841
Total.....	1,050,526,967	207,274,557	170,881,743	238,686,872
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.				
1907, January 1:				
On farms and ranges.....	1,846,578,000	428,064,000	204,210,000	417,791,000

TABLE C.—Total number of domestic animals, 1900 and 1907, in contiguous United States.  
[Including calves, colts, and lambs under 1 year.]

Date.	Total.	Cattle.		
		Total.	Dairy cows.	Other cattle.
CENSUS.				
1900, June 1:	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Number.</i>
On farms and ranges.....	213,622,799	67,719,410	17,135,633	50,583,777
Off farms and ranges.....	6,776,626	1,616,422	973,033	643,389
Total.....	220,399,425	69,335,832	18,108,666	51,227,166
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.				
1907, January 1:				
On farms and ranges.....	204,132,000	72,534,000	20,968,000	51,566,000
Date.	Horses.	Mules.	Sheep.	Swine.
CENSUS.				
1900, June 1:	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Number.</i>
On farms and ranges.....	18,267,020	3,264,615	61,503,713	62,868,041
Off farms and ranges.....	2,936,881	173,908	231,301	1,818,114
Total.....	21,203,901	3,438,523	61,735,014	64,686,155
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.				
1907, January 1:				
On farms and ranges.....	19,747,000	3,817,000	53,240,000	54,794,000

NOTE.—The number of sheep and swine January 1 is 15 to 20 per cent below the number of the preceding June 1.

Mr. Speaker, a very cursory examination of these tables discloses the great importance of the meat animals of this country. They furnish not only one-third of the food of the nation, but sustain an export trade amounting in value to \$200,000,000 annually. If the value of the exports of live animals and of dairy, packing-house, and other animal products be combined, the exports have ranged during the last ten years from about \$200,000,000 to \$270,000,000 annually.

TABLE D.—Value of exports of live animals and dairy, packing-house, and other animal products, 1897–1906.

Year ending June 30—	
1897.....	\$188,322,221
1898.....	217,808,053
1899.....	218,377,750
1900.....	233,764,590
1901.....	254,966,844
1902.....	250,815,851
1903.....	220,998,208
1904.....	233,034,209
1905.....	224,000,796
1906.....	268,748,834

The interest of the consumer in this matter is often overlooked, and it may be affected to the extent of many millions of dollars annually. It is the consumer, fully as much as other

parties, who would be benefited by the quinquennial census of farm products and domestic animals. It has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture that in 1900 the production of meat, in terms of dressed weight and of weight of extra edible parts not included in dressed weight, amounted to 19,000,000,000 pounds, of which about 2,400,000,000 pounds were exported.

TABLE E.—Meat production, exports, and consumption, expressed in pounds of dressed weight and weight of extra edible parts, 1900.

Kind of meat.	Production.	Net exports (mean of three years).	
		Pounds.	Pounds.
Beef, including veal.....	8,771,263,000	830,855,000	7,940,408,000
Mutton, including lamb.....	1,135,484,000	615,000	1,134,869,000
Pork, including lard.....	9,279,583,000	1,601,565,000	7,678,018,000
Total.....	19,186,330,000	2,433,025,000	16,753,305,000

If, through any failure on the part of the Bureau of the Census or of the Department of Agriculture to report the full number of meat animals, the price of meat at retail were to be advanced as little as one-quarter of a cent a pound, the meat expense of the consumers of the country, upon the basis of the consumption of 1900, would be advanced about \$42,000,000, and an increase of 1 cent per pound would mean to them an advance of \$168,000,000 in their annual meat bill.

Are not these great interests entitled to most serious consideration at our hands?

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word about the necessity of a more frequent census of the acreage planted to the more important crops. Recently the Keep Commission, a board consisting of some of the most intelligent officials connected with this Administration, recommended that an agricultural census be taken every year. I myself do not think there is a necessity for that, but I do think there is necessity that we have more frequent and more accurate knowledge of the acreage of the important crops. It would be of incalculable benefit to the Bureau of Statistics of the Agricultural Department in making its annual estimates if it could have a quinquennial census of the acreage planted, thereby preventing to a great extent or lessening the chances of making inaccurate estimates. If a census could be had every five years, it would decrease the percentage of chances of error creeping into its estimates, which might increase from year to year as we get away from the decennial census result, which is now the sole standard.

There are frequent changes in the acreage planted to the more important crops, sometimes from one cause and sometimes from another. The price for wheat or cotton being very high one year may result in a very large increase in the acreage for the succeeding year, or the invasion of a section of our country by an insect pest may, as it frequently does, result in a material reduction in the acreage planted to an important crop. And when you consider that agriculture furnishes the exports that retain for our country the balance of trade in her favor, I think everything should be done that can be done to aid the farmer to intelligently and profitably market the fruits of his labor.

To illustrate my meaning, Mr. Speaker, we all must recognize the importance of accurate statistical information relating to wheat. It is not only important as a source of domestic food, but it has been valuable as an article of export. A knowledge of the quantity of wheat raised in this country is of great importance not alone to the farmer and the miller, but also to the vast number of bread consumers. For years the amount produced has been so large that the surplus itself has been of great proportions, great enough to exert a very large influence upon world prices, if not at times a dominating one. More than one-fifth of the wheat of the world is raised in the United States, with a value in recent years that reaches \$500,000,000.

TABLE F.—Place of United States in world's production of wheat.

Year.	The world (nearly).	United States.	
		Production.	Fraction of the world's crop.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Per cent.
1899.....	2,783,885,000	658,534,252	23.7
1901.....	2,955,975,000	748,460,218	25.3
1902.....	3,126,624,000	670,063,008	21.4
1903.....	3,224,993,000	637,821,835	19.8
1904.....	3,170,723,000	562,399,517	17.4
1905.....	3,337,400,000	692,979,489	20.8
1906.....	3,209,464,000	735,260,970	21.6

<sup>a</sup> Census.

TABLE G.—Wheat production, exports, and consumption, 1899–1906.

Year.	Production.		Domestic exports, year beginning July 1. (Flour reduced to wheat, at 4½ bushels per barrel.)	Consumption of domestic crop (including seed and animal feed).
	Quantity.	Farm value.		
	<i>Bushels.</i>		<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
1899 (census).....	658,534,252	\$369,945,320	186,096,762	472,437,490
1901.....	748,460,218	467,350,156	234,772,516	513,687,702
1902.....	670,063,008	422,224,117	202,905,598	467,157,410
1903.....	637,821,835	443,024,826	120,727,613	517,094,222
1904.....	552,399,517	510,439,874	44,112,810	508,286,607
1905.....	692,979,489	518,372,727	97,609,007	a 595,370,482
1906.....	735,260,970	490,332,760		

\* Stocks on hand at beginning and end of this year as well as of previous years modify the apparent consumption.

It is patent that any ignorance with regard to the supply of wheat which would indicate a shortage that would increase the price by, say of 5 or 10 cents per bushel, might increase the consumers' expense for flour to the extent of \$25,000,000 to \$50,000,000 annually. This is on the basis of a consumption of 5½ bushels of wheat per capita annually for food purposes. Its market price might be materially affected because of a lack of such information.

But, Mr. Speaker, I now want a word about cotton—our most important crop. Cotton is more sensitive to influences upon its price than any other crop or product of the farm, and, more than any other product, it is the object of false reports, of efforts legitimate and illegitimate to depress or raise its price. Until within the last half dozen years the cotton grower was the frequent victim of the professional crop estimator, whose object is always to overestimate the crop and thus depress the price.

Mr. Speaker, this situation, so disastrous to the cotton growers, has now been largely relieved, because the professional estimators have been put out of confidence, if not out of business, by the two governmental offices that now issue crop reports—the Bureau of the Census, and the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture. The cotton crop alone is of such great importance that it should have the benefit of a quinquennial census of acreage in order that the Department of Agriculture may be given every opportunity to make its annual estimate of the yield just as accurate, just as near the truth as possible. To do this the Department of Agriculture must have a foundation not more than five years distant at the farthest.

The cotton crop of this country now amounts to more than 5,000,000,000 pounds annually, with a value, not including seed, of \$500,000,000, or, with seed, of \$650,000,000. Two-thirds of the cotton of the world is raised in the United States, and about the same fraction of the world's exports of cotton go out of this country, mostly to Europe. Let the exports of cotton from this country cease and the apparent balance of trade in favor of this country on account of the interchange of commodities would be nearly, if not completely, extinguished.

The consequences of false reports concerning the prospective quantity of the cotton crop are very large, and as far as they are merely a question of dollars can be approximately ascertained. If the Government were to cease its cotton reports and the crop left at the mercy of the speculators, for every cent per pound that the price were unfairly depressed the growers would lose \$50,000,000 or more, according to the size of the crop; and to a proportionate degree the whole country would suffer because of the decreased value of our exports.

TABLE H.—Production, exports, and consumption of cotton, 1899–1906.

[500-pound bales, gross weight.]

Year.	Production.		Domestic exports, year beginning September 1.	Consumption of domestic crop.
	Quantity.	Value, not including linters.		
	<i>Bales.</i>		<i>Bales.</i>	<i>Bales.</i>
1899.....	9,459,935	\$323,758,171	6,505,133	2,954,802
1900.....	10,266,527		7,178,782	3,087,745
1901.....	9,675,771		7,245,507	2,430,264
1902.....	10,827,168	421,687,941	7,286,748	3,540,420
1903.....	10,045,615	576,499,824	6,575,922	3,469,693
1904.....	13,679,954	561,100,386	9,546,384	4,133,570
1905.....	10,804,556	556,833,818	7,302,818	3,501,738

TABLE I.—Importance of cotton and other principal products in the exports of the United States.

[Department of Commerce and Labor.]

Article or group of articles.	Value of domestic exports, year ending June 30—			
	1904.		1905.	
	Value.	Per cent.	Value.	Per cent.
Cotton fiber.....	\$372,049,264	25.9	\$381,398,939	25.6
Breadstuffs.....	149,050,378	10.4	107,732,910	7.2
Provisions.....	176,027,586	12.3	169,998,873	11.4
Iron and steel, manufactures of.....	111,948,586	7.8	134,728,363	9.0
Agriculture, products of.....	853,643,073	59.5	821,074,439	55.0
Manufactures.....	452,415,921	31.5	543,620,243	36.5
All other.....	129,120,023	9.0	127,049,959	8.5
Total domestic exports.....	1,435,179,017	100.0	1,491,744,641	100.0

  

Article or group of articles.	Value of domestic exports, year ending June 30, 1906.		Six months ending December 31, 1906.	
	Value.	Per cent.	Value.	Per cent.
Cotton fiber.....	\$401,005,921	23.3	\$251,726,379	27.1
Breadstuffs.....	186,468,901	10.9	90,954,906	9.8
Provisions.....	210,990,065	12.3	98,283,829	10.6
Iron and steel, manufactures of.....	160,984,985	9.4	87,823,682	9.5
Agriculture, products of.....	969,457,306	56.4	(a)	(a)
Manufactures.....	603,227,836	35.1	(a)	(a)
All other.....	145,268,240	8.5	(a)	(a)
Total domestic exports.....	1,717,953,382	100.0	928,328,154	100.0

\* The Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor has made a new classification, which renders it impossible, at this time, to compare with preceding years.

How important is this crop, not alone to the section producing it, but to all the United States? Can we afford to fail to do anything within our power which will tend to increase its production? Is it not to our interest to do all we can, considering its importance as an export product, to increase its market value?

Mr. Speaker, it is palpable that frequent information concerning the prospective production and the harvested amount of the principal farm crops is essential alike to successful agriculture, to the stability of the business of marketing the crops, and to the financial safety of the manufacturers who use them as raw materials.

So well has this matter been understood that traders and manufacturers who have had a business large enough to sustain the expense have for many years undertaken to acquire a knowledge of present conditions affecting principal farm crops; and for a shorter period of time these efforts have been supplemented by private crop-reporting agencies, which have sold their reports or have given them gratuitously to the public in order that they might sell their publications.

In more recent years most of these private lines of crop estimation have drifted toward, if not positively into, the uses of speculators and gamblers in prices. As far as these private agencies are concerned, some of them make earnest endeavors to publish the truth; others are at the service of bulls or bears in the market, if they are not actually manipulated by them.

If left to themselves they would create a situation in which the few would profit at the expense of the many, and these few at any time would be in danger of themselves becoming losers to another set of winners for the moment.

In the meantime the farmers, the producers of fabulous contributions to the wealth of the nation, the men upon whom the prosperity of the nation rests and ever must rest, would find their crops the football of speculation and price gambling were it not for an impartial service furnishing accurate statistics.

It is practically out of the question that 100,000, much less 1,000,000, farmers should combine to report to a central office of their organization information which would enable that office to indicate the size of the forthcoming crops or of the harvested crops. Even if such large numbers of farmers should cooperate for this purpose and find incorruptible managers of the undertaking, there would be small confidence in the accuracy of the work, and those who buy these crops from the farmers would reject the estimates for fear that self-interest might have exerted a controlling influence in their preparation. Still we need estimates, impartial and as near accurate as possible, and these are now being given us by the able and upright statistician, Mr. Victor H. Olmsted, who heads the Bureau of Statistics in the Agricultural Department.



In such a large field of production as that of the United States, with crops so large as to be beyond the efforts of the mind to grasp, with countless diversities of conditions of soil, of rainfall, of heat, and of transportation, with its numerous antagonistic forces within the domain of production, of trade, and of industrial consumption, and particularly with its greater antagonisms reaching out from each of these domains into one or both of the others, it becomes a herculean task to prepare with any degree of accuracy an estimate of any particular crop. It is distinctly a situation in which a governmental office must be called into requisition, and it should be required to establish facts and to make them known to all parties. To do this in such a way as to win the confidence of the public every facility for securing accuracy should be afforded.

The system of estimation should be as perfect as it can be devised, and it can be readily seen that the success in making such estimates depends essentially upon a base line of established fact. This all-important base line has so far been furnished the statistician of the Department of Agriculture only once in each decade.

Mr. Speaker, to furnish an additional base line is the purpose of this measure. I think the facts I have brought to your attention demonstrate the necessity of a restricted agricultural census midway between the decennial census.

The interests that are concerned and that would be benefited by this extra agricultural census are too large to be measured. On the part of the farmers alone there is a capital which has now reached \$28,000,000,000. On the part of the traders in farm products and industrial consumers of them no corresponding figure can be estimated.

A quinquennial census of live stock and of the acreage of the important crops can be taken for about \$900,000; this amount distributed over a period of ten years would be \$90,000 a year. This would cover the cost of this all-important work. How trivial this sum is compared with the interests to be affected. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to read from the hearings had in support of this bill a short statement by Mr. Secretary Wilson. When asked to express his views with reference thereto he said:

Secretary WILSON. Look up the discussion, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the taking of a quinquennial census of manufactures, and apply every word of the reasons therein set forth to a quinquennial census of crop acreage and live stock. There is not a reason given for having a census taken of manufactures that does not apply with much greater force to a census taken of those things mentioned in this bill.

We sell every year to foreign countries approximately \$900,000,000 worth of farm products. In round numbers, \$250,000,000 of that is live stock and animal products; \$650,000,000 of that is the value of the farm crops of the country—first, corn; I shall not mention hay; next, cotton, then wheat, rice, etc.

The farmers of the United States last year produced, using round numbers, \$6,415,000,000 worth of farm products and sent abroad approximately \$900,000,000 worth, which is considerably more than half of all the stuff we export in a year.

Mr. BURLESON evidently has in mind a quinquennial census between the decennials, for the purpose of giving to those who are growing these articles and those who are dealing in them a closer idea of the tendency and trend of production along those lines. Before there was a permanent Census Bureau provided for, the Department of Agriculture had for many years been in the habit of making estimates of the production of all those things. But the time between decennial censuses was too long, because the increase of production of one class of things and the possible standstill or decrease in the production of another might have a very great influence on the producer and the dealer in the United States. The benefit that would come to the Department of Agriculture would be that instead of having once in ten years a reliable basis for estimating we should have it once in five years.

Mr. Speaker, every time there is a long gap between the Government reports upon the conditions of the crops or the size of the crops private agencies begin to get in their work, and there never has been a case when these private agencies, unless checked through Government sources of information, have not overestimated the production, with a consequent depression of prices. To-day if the Government should cease to make its estimate of the cotton crop, we might just as well put the price fixing of that great product in the hands of Mr. Buston, Mr. Neill, and other professional estimators. For a number of years I have been laboring to make the estimates issued by these professional estimators as little hurtful to the farmer as possible. It was to accomplish this end that I caused to be enacted the law providing for the Ginn's reports, and it is a source of much satisfaction to me that the Neills and Bustons can not affect the market price of cotton as they once could by giving out gross and outrageous overestimates of the crop. The passage of this bill will still further aid in securing honest and accurate statistics relating to this important crop and thereby aiding in making still less hurtful the practices of the professional estimators.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to show the importance of this measure. I believe it is of vast importance to the people of the entire country, and especially to the people of the South. After a most careful hearing, the Committee on the Census, on

April 31 of last year, unanimously reported the same, and now for a year it has been pending on the Calendar awaiting consideration at the hands of this House. I have repeatedly made efforts to secure an opportunity to have the same given a hearing. In these efforts I have had the cooperation of the chairman of the Census Committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]. We have gone to the extent of asking that the bill be taken up on suspension day, when, as we all know, it would require two-thirds majority to pass it; but, Mr. Speaker, all my efforts have resulted in failure, and this bill, though of the utmost importance to my people, will die upon the adjournment of this body day after to-morrow. I now send to the Clerk's desk, and ask that same be read, a letter I have recently received from the Secretary of the National Live Stock Association of America.

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,  
Denver, Colo., January 29, 1907.

HON. ALBERT S. BURLESON,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to inclose you herewith copy of a resolution adopted at the Tenth Annual Convention of this association, held at Denver, Colo., January 23, 1907, indorsing your bill for a new and more frequent census of live stock in the United States. I trust you will have this resolution read in Congress and referred to the proper committee.

If there is any assistance our association can render you in having this bill enacted into law, please advise.

Very respectfully, yours,

T. W. TOMLINSON, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask that the resolution be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution adopted at the Tenth Annual Convention of the American National Live Stock Association, held at Denver, Colo., January 22 and 23, 1907.

Whereas live stock growers of the United States are absolutely without correct information as to the number of animals being produced for food purposes; and

Whereas it would be greatly to the advantage of both the producer and the consumer to have correct data as to the probable meat supply for present and future markets; and

Whereas the Federal Government provides estimates regarding crops, such as cotton, wheat, etc., greatly to the advantage of the producers of those commodities; and

Whereas we believe the Government should supply similar information as to live stock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American National Live Stock Association, in convention assembled in Denver, Colo., January 22 and 23, 1907, respectfully petitions the Federal Government to at once take a full and comprehensive census of all cattle, sheep, and hogs in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the bill now pending in Congress providing for such census every five years, known as the "Burleson bill," be hereby indorsed by this convention; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the proper Department of the Federal Government in Washington and to all Members of Congress.

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy.

T. W. TOMLINSON, Secretary.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the fate of this bill is an apt illustration of the tremendous power which the majority of the membership of this body has lodged in the hands of our presiding officer. Here is a bill of tremendous importance to all the people of the United States. It has been reported favorably, both Democrats and Republicans joining with unanimity in recommending its passage. I am confident if I had been permitted by the organization of this House to bring it before this body that this bill, with all its provisions fully understood, would have received the support of 90 per cent of the Members of this House. No difficulty was experienced when the effort was made to secure a quinquennial census of manufacturers; but notwithstanding the persistence with which I have urged this quinquennial census of agriculture, only disappointment has been my portion. I have been unable to secure even consideration of same.

Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to reintroduce this bill at the beginning of the Sixtieth Congress, and I shall press it to enactment if energy and persistence can possibly accomplish that end.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. LAMB.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 23630. An act authorizing the President to nominate and appoint Birchie O. Mahaffey, John A. Cleveland, and Traugott F. Keller as second lieutenants in the United States Army;

H. R. 25630. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled 'An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia,' approved June 8, 1906;"

H. R. 19275. An act for the relief of T. E. Boyt;

H. R. 6104. An act to reimburse John Waller, late postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., for moneys expended in carrying the mails;

H. R. 25846. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Calhoun Falls;

H. R. 25848. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Andersonville Shoals;

H. R. 25847. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Hattons Ford;

H. R. 25850. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Trotters Shoal;

H. R. 20128. An act to complete the naval record of Patrick Naddy;

H. R. 8984. An act to amend the laws governing labor or improvements upon mining claims in Alaska;

H. R. 25738. An act to authorize the Cairo and Tennessee River Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River;

H. R. 11040. An act to authorize the receivers of public moneys for land districts to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States certain sums embraced in their accounts of unearned fees and unofficial moneys;

H. R. 24122. An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad;

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the wearing of the distinctive badge adopted by the Army and Navy Union upon all occasions of ceremony;

H. J. Res. 240. Joint resolution to create a joint committee to consider the revision and codification of the laws of the United States;

H. R. 15320. An act to remove charge of desertion standing against Peter Parsch;

H. R. 22210. An act to correct the military record of Homer Quick;

H. R. 11044. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury, in certain contingencies, to refund to receivers of public moneys acting as special disbursing agents amounts paid by them out of their private funds;

H. R. 25716. An act to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River above the village of Monticello, Wright County, Minn.," approved June 14, 1906;

H. R. 25717. An act to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Wright County, Minn.," approved June 14, 1906;

H. R. 24390. An act to correct the military record of Charles H. Kellen;

H. R. 24605. An act granting to the Norfolk and Portsmouth Traction Company the right to operate trains through the military reservation on Willoughby Spit, Norfolk County, Va.;

H. R. 25776. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Middleton Shoals;

H. R. 25795. An act to authorize the Pensacola and Northeastern Railroad Company, a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, to construct a bridge over the Escambia River between the counties of Santa Rosa and Escambia, in the State of Florida;

H. R. 25401. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to make certain disposition of condemned guns and cannon balls;

H. R. 21857. An act to correct the military record of Jacob Rockwell;

H. R. 25774. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Turner Shoals;

H. R. 25773. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at McDaniel Shoals; and

H. R. 19524. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 19, 1906.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 25483. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes;

H. R. 19751. An act to authorize the Natchez Electric Street Railway and Power Company to construct and operate an electric railway along the national cemetery roadway at Natchez, Miss.;

H. R. 25832. An act to authorize Herman L. Hartenstein to construct a dam across the St. Joseph River near the village of Mottville, St. Joseph County, Mich.;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Henry O. Bassett, heir of Henry Opeman Bassett, deceased;

H. R. 10095. An act making certain changes in the postal laws;

H. R. 19500. An act for the relief of Indian traders Marion Wescott, F. F. Green, and J. A. Leige, assignee of Joseph F. Gauthier, a Menominee Indian trader, with the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin;

H. R. 24816. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the withdrawal from bond tax free of domestic alcohol when rendered unfit for beverage or liquid medicinal uses by mixture with suitable denaturing materials," approved June 7, 1906;

H. R. 24833. An act for the relief of the Louisiana Molasses Company (Limited) and the Louisiana Distilling Company;

H. R. 21091. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter on the roll of Capt. Orlando Humason's Company B, First Oregon Mounted Volunteers, the name of Hezekiah Davis;

H. R. 25801. An act granting an honorable discharge to Seth Davis;

H. R. 22588. An act for the relief of homestead entrymen who have paid more than the lawful purchase money;

H. R. 25437. An act to grant American registry to the German bark *Mariechen*;

H. R. 15859. An act ceding certain lands to Colorado State Agricultural College;

H. R. 25849. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Cherokee Shoals;

H. R. 25811. An act to authorize the Monroe, Farmerville and Northwestern Railway Company to construct a bridge over the Ouachita River and one over the D'Arbonne River, in Louisiana;

H. R. 13418. An act for the relief of W. S. Hammaker;

H. R. 25474. An act to amend sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same;"

H. R. 25739. An act to authorize the Cairo and Tennessee River Railroad Company to construct bridges across Cumberland River;

H. R. 11401. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kling;

H. J. Res. 236. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish metal for a bell;

H. R. 10305. An act to provide for the repayment of certain customs dues; and

H. R. 8699. An act for the relief of James A. Carroll.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. R. 92. A joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of War to permit Jose March Duplat to receive instructions at the Military Academy at West Point;

S. 8580. An act granting land to Anna Johnson;

S. 7550. An act for the relief of Harry A. Young;

S. 6729. An act authorizing the President to appoint Webb C. Maglathlin a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service;

S. 6134. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota of certain tracts of land for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State Historical Society;

S. 5869. An act for the relief of Larvon Gordon;

S. 8540. An act to ratify a certain lease with the Seneca Nation of Indians;

S. 5660. An act for the relief of William N. Hughes;

S. 4964. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Walters;

S. 8427. An act to annul certain titles to land acquired by judicial proceedings in the courts of the United States in Texas, and for other purposes;

S. 8303. An act to establish the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace; and

S. 7840. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Towne.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, during this session of Congress, a certain bill which I deem, if enacted into law, one of the greatest importance to all of the people of the United States, and I feel confident that when its provisions are fully understood by the Congress it will almost unanimously meet its approval. During this short session, owing to the vast amount of other business which has engrossed attention, little opportunity has been given for consideration of this measure; and my purpose at this time in addressing myself, as I shall, to the provisions of this bill is that the Congress and the country at large may in the interim consider it and be prepared to place a just estimate upon it, and that we may, during the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, act accordingly. The bill as introduced is known as H. R. 24757, and entitled "A bill to provide an annual appropriation for industrial



education in agricultural high schools and in city high schools and for branch agricultural experiment stations, and regulating the expenditures thereof." Specifically its language is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid, as hereinafter provided, to each State and Territory for the maintenance of instruction in agriculture and home economics in agricultural high schools of secondary grade and instruction in mechanic arts and home economics in city high schools of secondary grade, a sum of money equal to 10 cents per capita of the population of each State and Territory, respectively, as shown by the last preceding national or State census, as shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Agriculture and estimated for in the annual estimates submitted to Congress for the Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That the funds thus appropriated shall be used only for instruction in agriculture, mechanic arts, and home economics, and that all States and Territories and all schools accepting these funds shall provide other funds with which to pay the cost of providing the necessary lands and buildings and of instruction in all general studies required to make well-rounded high school courses of study: *And provided further*, That not less than one-half of the sum thus appropriated to any State or Territory shall be expended for instruction in agriculture and home economics in agricultural high schools maintained under State authority in rural communities, and the number of such agricultural high schools which shall be entitled to receive the benefits of this act in any one State or Territory shall not exceed one school for each ten counties in that State or Territory.

SEC. 2. That there shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid, as hereinafter provided, to each State and Territory for the maintenance of branch agricultural experiment stations under the direction of the State agricultural experiment stations now established or which may hereafter be established in accordance with the act of Congress approved March 7, 1862, the sum of \$2,500 for each branch experiment station already established by legislative enactment of the respective States and Territories, or which shall be established by said States or Territories in connection with agricultural high schools as appropriated for by this act: *Provided*, That no State or Territory shall be entitled to the benefits of section 2 of this act until its legislature shall by law provide for the establishment of such branch stations and shall provide annually for the equipment and maintenance of such branch stations a sum at least equivalent to that appropriated annually to the State or Territory under section 2 of this act; and the sum paid to each State or Territory under section 2 of this act shall be applied only to paying the necessary expenses of conducting at such branch experiment stations experiments bearing directly upon the agricultural industry of the United States, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States or Territories and the respective agricultural regions therein.

SEC. 3. That the sums hereby appropriated to the States and Territories for the maintenance of branch agricultural experiment stations and for instruction in agriculture, mechanic arts, and home economics shall be annually paid, one-half on the 1st day of July of each year and one-half on the 1st day of January of each year, by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture, out of the Treasury of the United States, to the treasurer or other officer duly appointed by the governing boards of said experiment stations and schools to receive the same, and such officers shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture on or before the 1st day of September of each year a detailed statement of the amounts so received during the previous year and of its disbursement on schedules prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture. The grants of money authorized by this act are made subject to legislative assent of the several States and Territories to the purpose of said grants.

SEC. 4. That if any portion of these moneys received by the designated officers of any State or Territory for the maintenance of instruction in agriculture, mechanic arts, and home economics or for the maintenance of branch experiment stations as provided in this act shall by any action or contingency be diminished or lost or be misapplied, it shall be replaced by said State or Territory concerned, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to such State or Territory: *Provided*, That no portion of said moneys shall be applied directly or indirectly under any pretense whatever to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings or to the purchase or rental of lands.

SEC. 5. That it shall be the duty of each of said city high schools, agricultural high schools, and branch experiment stations annually, on or before the 1st day of February, to make to the governor of the State or Territory in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations, including a statement of receipts and expenditures, a copy of which report shall be sent to each of said agricultural high schools, city high schools, and branch experiment stations, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, said reports to be made on blanks to be supplied by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 6. That on or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury as to each State and Territory whether it has complied with the provisions of this act and is entitled to receive its share of the allotment herein provided for branch experiment stations, for agricultural high schools, and for city high schools under this act and the amount thereupon which it is entitled to receive. If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold a certificate from any State or Territory for the whole or part of its appropriation, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President and the amount involved shall be kept separately in the Treasury until the close of the next Congress in order that the State or Territory may, if it shall so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury, and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby charged with the proper administration of this law.

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make an annual report to Congress on the receipts and expenditures and on the work of the agricultural high schools, city high schools, and branch agricultural experiment stations in all of the States and Territories to which allotments are made, and also whether the appropriation of any State or Territory has been withheld, and, if so, the reasons therefor.

SEC. 8. That Congress may at any time amend, suspend, or repeal any or all the provisions of this act.

A Federal appropriation is sought for the purpose of encouraging the several States and Territories in the promotion of industrial and agricultural education, and with their cooperation. It is mainly for the purpose of encouraging a type of education for the mass of our people that will train them for the practical affairs of life; and while the Morrill Act of 1862 has undoubtedly stimulated great activity along this line, the present measure supplants it and to a large extent will consummate the purposes desired. The science of agriculture is basic in principle, and sooner or later we should return to first principles, and in the last analysis we must recur to the soil as the fundamental source of our wealth, prosperity, and happiness as a people. The practical training to be obtained, if this bill becomes a law, for the young men and women on the farm will undoubtedly make country life more attractive and beneficial, and the industrial training sought to be encouraged in city schools add very materially to the prosperity and happiness of all those who will avail themselves of the opportunities thus provided. The measure therefore responds to the needs of both rural and city conditions.

This bill is designed especially to secure simple justice to the workers and home makers of our country. We have too long confined technical education to the professional classes. Let us carry out the wise plan begun by Congress in 1862—the land-grant act establishing colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts—and provide, along with general schooling, industrial education, not only to the privileged 5 per cent, but also to the 95 per cent who are doing the world's work.

The increase of knowledge, the specialization of industries, and the close division of labor have made a new world, into which the graduates of our schools are precipitated. The old education leads the pupil to believe that he is prepared for life. His preparation is only general. The new education must prepare the pupil for some specific line of life. It must be both broad and practical. It must combine the theme written in the book, the theme written in the soil and in the machinery, with the inspiration for the best living which modern conditions can provide.

The Congress of the United States and other legislative bodies in the world ere long will have spent more than \$100,000,000 in agricultural research. Along other lines much greater sums are being expended in university laboratories, in laboratories supported by our great industrial organizations, and in private laboratories devoted to research and invention. The utility results of science have gained recognition in agriculture, in the non-agricultural industries, and in home making. The much-enlarged body of knowledge rapidly becoming available in all vocations has made necessary such organization of our school system that the rising generation may have the key to this new knowledge. The old forms of education, which have so wonderfully aided in bringing forward our civilization, must be rearranged, that the curriculum of our schools may be broadened and enriched with this rapidly accumulating new knowledge.

We shall soon have about 90,000,000 of people in this country, one-third of whom, or 30,000,000, will be of school age—between 5 and 20 years—and entitled to school privileges. The Twelfth Census, using round numbers, showed that one-half the persons of school age attended school in 1900, and thus we may calculate that we shall soon have 15,000,000 pupils in schools. Since practically one-third of our population is engaged in agriculture and two-thirds in nonagricultural pursuits, we may roughly say that we shall have 5,000,000 pupils preparing for country life and 10,000,000 preparing for city life. Since three teachers are required for each 100 pupils, we shall need 150,000 teachers in country-life education and 300,000 teachers for schools leading to city life, or a total of 450,000 teachers. With the material increase in the numbers of pupils taking secondary and higher courses of study, we may hope to have 7 per cent of American youth entering high schools of secondary grade, and of these 2 per cent entering higher institutions of collegiate grade; but the great educational problem will remain—the training of the 93 per cent who will stop with the primary city school and the primary rural school. As our schools are improved in their general educational work and in their efficiency to aid the pupil to make a good living, we may expect to increase the proportion of children attending school. Since the teachers in the primary schools are mainly trained for their work in the secondary schools, the most important means for improving the primary schools is better to provide for the preparation of their teachers. Our high schools have three important functions, viz: (1) To give to a large number of people a better education that individually their success may be greater; (2) to place among the people of the country a large number of trained workers whose success, example, and help will enable all people with whom



they associate to become more efficient and more successful, and (3) to prepare the necessary teachers to conduct the primary schools in the most efficient manner possible.

Our educators, farmers, professional, and business classes are of one mind in a desire that the evolution of our school system shall be directed into lines which shall carry to all the people our accumulating technical knowledge and thus add efficiency to our workers. When our population reaches 90,000,000, we shall have engaged in gainful occupations 33,000,000 of people. Of the latter at least 30,000,000 will be interested in agriculture and mechanic arts education and at least another 25,000,000 in home economics education. At \$1 a day the industrial and home-making value of these 55,000,000 people, counting 300 days as a year, is \$16,500,000,000. It would seem easy by sharply turning our school system somewhat more toward technical instruction to increase the economic efficiency of our workers 1 per cent, or \$165,000,000 annually. This bill proposes to devote \$8,000,000 to this purpose.

In 1862 the Congress of the United States ventured upon an experiment by providing for the establishment in each State of a college devoted to agriculture and the mechanic arts. Out of this action has grown not a theory, but a condition. The situation demands that we utilize the results of these experiments and the new knowledge thus secured. The knowledge is of more value than any dozen mechanical inventions ever devised. Our American educational machine must be so evolved and even reorganized as to reach every industry and every home in the land. This bill undertakes to point the way and to provide the funds with which to accomplish this purpose. The undertaking is too important to be left to sporadic action, and is too expensive to be inaugurated systematically throughout the United States under any auspices less able to provide funds and to secure cooperative action than the Federal Government.

We now have over fifty State colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. Their past growth warrants the hope that before long they may have an average of 1,000 students each in collegiate courses related to industry; 500 in mechanic arts courses, 300 in agriculture, and 200 in home economics, or a total of 50,000 students, where there are now 20,000.

Minnesota, Nebraska, Alabama, Georgia, and other States have demonstrated that the industrial education started in our State colleges should be extended into a system of agricultural high schools and into our city high schools. The trend has been to organize an agricultural high school for each group of about ten counties, as has been done in Alabama and Georgia, and to develop mechanic arts education, both in separate city high schools and as courses of study in general city high schools. Minnesota and Nebraska led in devising and developing schools of agriculture of high school grade articulating with the college above, and with both the rural schools and the farms below. Alabama and Georgia have recently taken the lead in establishing one of these schools in each Congressional district. Minnesota and Nebraska have agricultural high schools with 600 and 300 students, respectively. The graduates of these schools nearly all go back to the farm. A very small number go into other vocations, and probably 10 per cent go forward into collegiate courses in agriculture, most of them to become agricultural technicians. These schools have demonstrated so effectively that farm boys and girls can be educated for country life and returned to country life that everyone who looks into the work of these institutions is ready to promote this kind of schools for the entire country.

To Georgia belongs the credit and honor of first taking the step thoroughly to establish a sufficient number of well-equipped agricultural high schools to meet the needs of the farm boys and farm girls of the State. Last July the Georgia legislature authorized Governor Terrell to establish an agricultural high school in each of Georgia's eleven Congressional districts. A State appropriation of \$6,000 was provided annually as a current expense fund with which to begin each school. The districts securing these schools were required to provide at least 200 acres of land and to erect buildings and equip the schools. The different localities sought to secure the location of these schools. The result was such that it is inspiring the entire country with an interest and faith in high school education in agriculture and home economics. By private subscription Georgia has raised \$800,000 with which to establish and equip these eleven schools. Never before have the American people so emphatically expressed their faith in agricultural education. In no way has the South better expressed the fact that she is rising from the difficulties and depression which resulted from the civil war.

The passage of this bill will precipitate a similar movement in every State in the Union. If all of the States will follow Georgia's example, we shall have 300 agricultural high schools

for our 3,000 agricultural counties. With each of these schools averaging 500 students we would have a total of 150,000 students in agricultural high schools, an average of 3,000 in each State. This number of students would provide a large number of men technically trained in agriculture to become leading farmers, and a large number of young women trained in home economics to develop exemplary farm homes. It would also provide a body of young people who could rapidly be developed into teachers who could carry instruction and inspiration in agriculture and home building into all the rural schools of the land and thus carry this education to all farm youth. There may be a difference of opinion as to whether we shall make our rural schools more efficient by retaining the present unit—the isolated rural school—or whether we should consolidate these into larger units. Which ever plan is pursued, all must agree that this class of schools must be improved by providing teachers trained both in general studies and in the subjects relating to the future life work of that 85 per cent of rural youth which will remain in country life. It may be presumed that the expense will not be very greatly different whether we develop the rural schools under a plan of consolidation or by adequately improving the little rural schools. At present we have no body of people in our rural communities who have either knowledge or faith to reorganize our country schools. Probably the chief function of the provisions of this bill will be to provide a large class of leaders in our rural communities who, as progressive farmers and home makers and as rural school-teachers, will press to a successful issue the development of our rural primary school system.

The State colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts established by the Congress have developed mechanic arts education even much more rapidly than agricultural education. The engineering courses of these colleges have been very successful and popular from the start, and this class of instruction has extended into numerous city high schools, as in the mechanic arts high schools of St. Paul, Pittsburg, Philadelphia, and Washington. The graduates of these colleges and high schools have profoundly modified our mechanical and transportation industries. Our manufacturing and transportation companies are in touch with these local mechanic arts high schools and with these State colleges and are offering good positions to every young man who shows technical instincts and ability. Graduates of these mechanic arts high schools in turn have carried the elements of this line of instruction under the name of "manual training" into very many of the primary city schools of the country. Most of these mechanic arts high schools are as yet relatively small because of the difficulty of securing local appropriations sufficient to pay the larger expenses of these more practical studies which require laboratories and shop practice as well as class-room instruction. This bill is designed to meet this difficulty. Our State colleges were more tardy in developing education in home economics than in either mechanic arts or agriculture, but even in this line it may be said that the Congressional act of 1862 has developed a revolution in education in domestic economy. Numerous of the State colleges having successfully organized instruction in domestic-science subjects have provided teachers who have successfully introduced this line of education into city high schools, agricultural high schools, and into a large proportion of the colleges and academies attended by women, and even into city primary schools and into some rural schools. It is found that this line of technical education is relatively inexpensive and yet very important for the future home makers.

Under the movement for industrial education and research started in the sixties, including the Federal Department of Agriculture, the State experiment stations, the State agricultural colleges, and the two or three dozen agricultural high schools, we now spend, exclusive of inspection and other general work, something like \$10,000,000. These expenditures have added not less than a billion dollars in value to the products of our American farms, shops, and other industries, and greatly improved the social conditions of our workers and of all our people. Thus for the price of one battle ship there is created sufficient additional wealth to pay two or three times over our direct and indirect expenses incident to war.

I maintain that we should have a properly equipped Army and Navy that we may have stability and peace for our industries; but, on the other hand, those who advocate large expenditures for the Army or for the Navy should be the first to see the importance of expenditures which create individual efficiency and wealth. Now that our national wealth has reached nearly \$100,000,000,000, our annual production nearly \$30,000,000,000, and our Federal appropriations nearly \$1,000,000,000, are we not ready seriously to consider the proposition of making it possible for every boy and girl in the entire country to secure at least the rudiments of technical industrial education? The



relatively small cost is clearly within the scope of our public financial ability.

Of the three great wastes in the economies—land, material, and labor—by far the greatest waste is from inefficient labor. It has been truthfully said that while America wastes land the Old World wastes labor. In America labor commands \$1 to \$2 a day; in Europe one-fourth of that amount, and in the Orient one-tenth of that amount. The greatest economic need is that our industries be so changed that labor be not wasted. The recent wonderful and far-reaching developments in transportation of all kinds is suddenly bringing together, in close economic competition, all the peoples of the entire world. The nation that uses its labor, lands, and products to the best advantage will take the lead in civilization and in power.

Can America afford to continue the kind of education which cultivates tastes too expensive for the earning capacities of her people, while other peoples are willing to labor cheaply and live within their means? Even more than with boys we are making the mistake of educating the tastes of our girls more rapidly than we are training them in the ability to secure those things which satisfy their tastes. Our most important racial and national institution—the home—can be developed along with our other institutions only as we give to it the discoveries of science and build it up through education. It is not enough that America have homes averaging better than homes of other parts of the world; they should be very much better. The leadership assumed by Congress in 1862 brought with it responsibilities. These responsibilities may now be clearly seen. There is only one organized body competent to deal with the question of the rapid development of technical education for the workers in the industries throughout all of the States, and that is this Congress.

This bill provides for the inauguration of a movement in industrial education second only in importance to the original bill of 1862 creating in America this class of education. It provides for introducing throughout all our public schools of a secondary or high school grade education in mechanic arts, agriculture, and home economics. The sum it is proposed to appropriate is less than 1 per cent of the revenues of the Government, and is based upon an appropriation to the various States and cities of 10 cents per capita of the inhabitants thereof provided that a like sum is raised by them. This means practically appropriating for the industrial education of each pupil of school age 30 cents per annum, or for each pupil actually in school 60 cents per annum.

The bill provides that the money allotted to each State shall be equitably divided between the city people and the country people. Each city will receive 10 cents per capita on its population at the last national or State census. The money thus allotted to the respective States and not apportioned to city high schools will be available for use toward the maintenance of one agricultural high school in each rural Congressional district, or its equivalent. Thus, my own State of Minnesota, with a population of about 2,000,000, half of whom are in cities, will receive \$200,000 annually, \$100,000 to be apportioned to the respective cities according to their population and \$100,000 to be used in eight or ten agricultural high schools distributed throughout the State. Under this bill thousands would be provided with industrial and agricultural education where now hundreds receive this kind of instruction in the one or two schools of each class now in operation.

The course of study in agricultural high schools and mechanic arts high schools, having now been under trial and development for nearly twenty years, has been nearly as well worked out as the general courses of study in our city high schools, and are also successfully articulated with the rural school and the primary city school below and with the college courses above. Passing the land-grant act of 1862 was an experiment, because no agricultural or mechanical college had then been successfully started. The passage of this measure would not be an experiment, because agricultural high schools and mechanic arts high schools, both including industrial work for women in relation to the home, are recognized as among our most successful institutions. It is believed by those well informed that every dollar appropriated for the Federal Department of Agriculture and for the State experiment stations and State college returns to the American people, or rather earns for the American people, at least \$20. There is no reason why the appropriations under this act shall be less productive.

The farmers of America have rapidly changed from an indifferent attitude toward so-called "book farming" to a high appreciation of and a profound respect for agricultural science and institutions devoted to improving agriculture. Education in mechanics and home economics has likewise risen to a plane of high appreciation. It requires no prophet to predict that

within ten years after the passage of a law as outlined in this bill the entire point of view recently held by the farmers of this country toward agricultural schools and by the practical men of affairs toward city high school education will have been changed.

The feverish desire to leave the land and go to the city will have been removed. Farms as places of business and farm homes as places to develop splendid families will be appreciated at their true American value. With the great Federal Department of Agriculture, with fifty State agricultural colleges and experiment stations, with two or three hundred agricultural high schools and branch experiment stations, and with tens of thousands of improved consolidated rural schools and with other educational machinery as college-extension work, and with highly developed agricultural literature, and with a like equipment for education in city industries, the American people will be so informed and inspired in industrial affairs and home making that we shall have a new America. The pivotal place in turning the education of our workers, whether in country or city, more toward the things with which they must deal is in the high school, because here the teachers for primary schools are trained in those subjects in which they are to instruct the primary pupils.

The provision in this bill which appropriates \$2,500 to be placed with an additional amount to be supplied by the respective States for branch experiment stations for each agricultural high school is important from two standpoints. It is necessary that the teachers of agriculture, horticulture, live stock, and dairying in these agricultural high schools have as part of their instructional machinery actual farm operations and such research work as the State experiment stations and the Federal Department of Agriculture may properly delegate to these institutions. The working out of crop rotations and farm plans, the testing of commercial fertilizers, the testing and breeding of plants, the demonstrating of methods of destroying insects, and many other similar lines will have a large value, both as part of the school education and as a means of working out improvements in agriculture.

The question is often asked, Why should the Federal Government take up the burden of the State? Will not the use of Federal money tend to retard activity along educational lines in the States and cause them to depend on Federal aid? Is Congress not already doing too much for the people of the States? Congress, and especially the State legislatures, have not taken full cognizance of the fact that the Federal Government raises and expends more than three times as much money as do all of the State governments combined. The fact that the Federal Government has the indirect, and therefore easy, methods of raising taxes, while the States have the direct and more difficult methods of raising taxes is the best of reasons why the Federal Government should lead general cooperative movements in bringing about important changes affecting the entire length and breadth of the country. Congress, with \$800,000,000, offering to cooperate with the States with their aggregate of \$200,000,000, will help the States so to increase their \$200,000,000 that they will have means with which to improve their secondary and primary schools, tasks which now seem so large as to well-nigh paralyze effort in many States. Material Federal aid will greatly encourage and inspire State and local effort. If this bill is passed, and the States duplicate the amount of money thus appropriated, American education can be put upon a new plane in every State in the Union. Georgia's experience shows that the States are willing to supply the equipment and part of the current-expense fund. Let the Federal Government meet Georgia halfway, and every State will follow the noble example set by that vigorous Commonwealth.

Does not this plan of using some of our immense national funds with which to build up local institutions decentralize rather than increase the tendency to centralization? How can we better strengthen the States than by turning over to State management funds with which to strengthen their educational institutions, around which local interest and local pride center?

This bill does not establish a new precedent in principle, because it simply carries out the precedent established in our country in organizing State colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts in 1862. The British Government several years ago, from their large income from taxes, passed an almost identical act, thus building up local institutions. Under that act technical education, for the most part secondary in grade, has been supplied to the people of the cities of the British Islands, and numerous agricultural high schools have been organized in individual counties or by groups of counties. Through the legislation provided in H. R. 24757 America will not only keep pace with the most progressive nations, but will be in a position to take the lead in industrial education for the masses.

We need to build up a class of people educated in distinctive industrial and agricultural schools, highly organized, so as to give instruction and to inculcate pride in industrial affairs and in the American home. So long as the teachers of our schools are trained in schools devoted mainly to nonindustrial interests they can not well build up an industrial community with full knowledge and inspiration for their life work. Let us have as a dominating force in the education of our country youth and our city youth teachers who are chosen as trained leaders in building up rural and industrial science and practice and in home making.

There is encouragement in the fact that year by year the strong men of the world's legislative bodies are joining the ranks of those who favor larger appropriations for research and education related to the industries. The time has arrived in many of the States when the farming interests demand that legislative bodies counteract the tendency to pile up the largest part of our annual increase of permanent wealth in our largest cities. Labor, too, under wise leadership, is ready to demand more of the fruits of science and art in the form of technical training for their children.

The proposition in this bill at first seems radical. When carefully considered it is not as radical as the proposition to build new battle ships. It is a plan for investing money in the higher industrial efficiency of the nation's 60,000,000 workers and in the better living of all people of all classes. It proposes that we give our workers a square deal by giving them a chance to secure technical training, as we now provide technical training for the professional classes. It looks to universal technical education. This kind of education is not a net expense. It is a net profit. It is an expenditure such as we make in business, only here the economic return plus the social benefit is greater than the expected profits in business. This plan is not an experiment. It will bring the results. No other solution has been offered to the problem of bringing to a free people the results accruing from their own expenditures in scientific research. If another plan superior to this can be devised, let us adopt it, and, failing in that, let us perfect and utilize the plan outlined in this bill.

#### PERSONAL REQUEST.

Mr. FLOOD, by unanimous consent, obtained consent to file, as a part of the report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, the views of the majority of the committee on Mount Weather, and to ask that the report filed by the chairman of the committee be reprinted with the majority's views on Mount Weather substituted for those of the chairman, and the chairman's views on Mount Weather be printed as a minority report from the committee on that subject.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House take a recess until 8.30 p. m.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say to gentlemen that the pension appropriation bill must again be sent to conference, and there are many other important bills that ought to be considered to-night, and they can not be considered without a quorum. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that the House take a recess until 8.30 p. m.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 8.30 o'clock p. m.

#### EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House (at 8.30 p. m.) resumed its session.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. ROSE, its assistant secretary, announced that the Senate had passed the bill of the House (H. R. 25692) to provide for an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of California, with an amendment thereto, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

#### NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN DISTRICTS OF CALIFORNIA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 25692) to provide for an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of California, with a Senate amendment thereto.

Mr. JENKINS. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. JENKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the pension appropriation bill, and ask that the report be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24640) "An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908; and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

WASHINGTON GARDNER,

W. P. BROWNLOW,

JOHN A. SULLIVAN,

*Conferees on the part of the House.*

P. J. McCUMBER,

N. B. SCOTT,

*Conferees on the part of the Senate.*

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I move that the House insist on its disagreement and accede to the request of the Senate for a conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. GARDNER of Michigan, Mr. BROWNLOW, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

#### CERTAIN STREET RAILWAY TRACKS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up a Senate bill and to make the motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

I move to suspend the rules and agree to the following:

"Ordered, That immediately upon the adoption of this order it shall be in order to take up the bill (S. 6147) entitled 'An act authorizing changes in certain street railway tracks within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' with the amendment thereto reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to offer thereto the following amendments: First, strike out section 13 of the House substitute providing for wide tires; second, to provide for universal 3-cent fares, to be collected only from passengers provided with seats; and after votes on the aforesaid amendments the question shall be on the committee amendment and on the bill to a final passage without intervening motion or appeal."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JAMES. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BABCOCK. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to twenty minutes and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] to twenty minutes.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the extension of the tracks of the existing street car lines to the Union Depot in the most direct way possible.

Mr. SULZER. Does it provide for 3-cent fares?

Mr. BABCOCK. The order provides for an amendment being offered for 3-cent fares.

Mr. SULZER. What does it provide about the fare?

Mr. BABCOCK. Three-cent fares, not to be paid unless a passenger is given a seat. Do you want any more?

Mr. SULZER. Oh, yes; transfers, too?

Mr. BABCOCK. That is the amendment that is to be considered.

Mr. SULZER. All right; it is about time the people got something. At last, it seems their day is coming.

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to this is the new construction of the Capital Traction Railway in northeast Washington that has been asked for by the citizens for many years, a good piece of construction that public policy demands. Further than that, Mr. Speaker, it reenacts what is known as the "smoke bill," that the House has passed once or twice before.

And I want to say just a word in reference to the smoke proposition. For several years the people of the District of Columbia—the manufacturers, the hotels, and the restaurants—have been obliged to comply with the present smoke law. Many of them have been fined many times. The electric light company has been driven out of the city, at a cost of \$1,000,000 to build a new plant on account of this smoke ordinance. Now, this bill provides that the steam locomotives in the city of Washington shall come under the provisions of this act, a matter of equity between the citizens of Washington and the locomotives in the city.

Mr. Speaker, this is all this bill provides, except that it provides that a motion shall be in order to strike out the provision for wide tires; that it shall be in order for the gentle-



man from Kentucky to offer an amendment for 3-cent fares. It ought to pass, it should pass, and this House will fail far short of its duty unless it does pass.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Does this resolution give any Member the liberty of proposing an amendment that any person shall be carried free on the street cars?

Mr. BABCOCK. It does not.

Mr. PAYNE. I am surprised that the gentleman has made that admission.

Mr. BABCOCK. I notice that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is not here.

Mr. SIMS. Yes; the gentleman is here. He will be in his seat in a moment.

Mr. BABCOCK. It was understood that he was to offer the amendment.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Mississippi understands that this motion, if carried, itself eliminates the wide-tire amendment.

Mr. BABCOCK. I do not think it does. It is in order for that motion to be considered, and, if the motion should be made, to strike it out. I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House the other day I opposed a motion to suspend the rules and put it upon its passage for two reasons, first, because if it were put on its passage on a motion to suspend the rules, the House would have no opportunity to discuss or to vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]; secondly, because the bill contained a provision requiring wide tires in the city of Washington. This provision was subject to a point of order under the ordinary procedure when the opportunity to make the point of order could be given to that provision, to which I was opposed independently of an opportunity of making the point of order.

The chairman of the District Committee now offers the bill with the broad-tire provision stricken out of the bill if this resolution is passed. Moreover, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] will be subject to discussion, adoption, amendment, or rejection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But the chairman of the District Committee says that the motion will have to be made in order to strike out the section relating to wide tires.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the broad-tire provision, section 13, is stricken out of the bill, as the gentleman presented it.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is the report, but I think the gentleman should make the motion to strike it out formally.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from Michigan agreed with me that the bill would be presented with that stricken out.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes; it says that it shall be in order to strike it out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it in order to make the point of order on it now?

Mr. BABCOCK. No; but make a motion to strike it out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the gentleman has not presented to the House the matter as he and I agreed that it should be presented.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes; he has as far as possible.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I insist upon is this: This bill to permit certain railroads to extend their lines to the Union Depot had placed upon it by the Committee on the District of Columbia a provision for broad tires for road wagons, which was not germane to the bill and against which a point of order would lie.

Now, unless the gentleman presents the bill in such shape as to enable me to make that point of order for the consideration of the Chair, then I must insist that this bill be defeated.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the section the gentleman refers to be stricken from the bill.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BABCOCK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the section be stricken from the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask the Speaker to read the order and to tell me whether or not, worded as it is, it would be in order for me to raise the point of order as to the germaneness of section 13. If it be in order for me to raise that point of order, I know it will have to go out on the point of order. Then I do not care. The point of order is that section 13, being an amendment, is not germane to the subject-matter of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that, by unanimous consent, the gentleman from Wisconsin can change his motion so as to put it in the following form, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Ordered*, That immediately upon the adoption of this order it shall be in order to take up the bill S. 6147, entitled "An act authorizing changes in certain street railway tracks within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," with the amendment thereto reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to offer thereto the following amendments:

First, to strike out section 13 of the House substitute, providing for wide tires, unless said amendment shall have been ruled out on a point of order, which is hereby authorized.

Second, to provide for universal 3-cent fares to be collected only from passengers provided with seats; and after votes on the aforesaid amendments the question shall be on the committee amendment and on the bill to a final passage without intervening motion or appeal.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I make the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman consumed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has fourteen minutes left.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I shall offer gives an opportunity to the House of Representatives to vote on a 3-cent fare. I desire to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] how much time he is willing to agree on for a discussion of this question as to the merits of the amendment?

Mr. BABCOCK. I understand there are twenty minutes on each side.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, no; that is on this question of suspending the rules upon my demand for a second.

Mr. SIMS. It is on the other also.

The SPEAKER. That question does not arise at this time.

Mr. JAMES. Then, Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard in support of the amendment that I shall presently offer affording 3-cent fares in this District.

We have been legislating for the various States trying to curb the rapacity of the railroads throughout the country, trying to make them deal equitably and fairly with the shippers, with the produce from the farm, with the great commerce of the country, and in that battle on behalf of the people in favor of justice to all I most heartily joined; and now, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge that this House remedy the daily outrage that is being perpetrated right within the shadow of this Capitol by the street car monopoly, an outrage being perpetrated on the laboring people, the men who work, the women who toil. It is for these that I now appeal.

Mr. Speaker, a 5-cent fare does not amount to much to the Members of Congress. It does not amount to anything to a man who has money, but when we consider the fact that it is 10 per cent, 15 per cent, 20 per cent, and sometimes 25 per cent of the wages of the laboring people of this District, people who labor by the hour for their money, to them it amounts to a very great deal. To these people who toil at 5 cents, 10 cents, and 15 cents an hour, when we consider, Mr. Speaker, that street car fares mean hours of toil to them, then it is time for this House of Representatives to give consideration to this question. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There are two street-car systems in this city. One is the Capital Traction Company, the other is the Washington Electric Company. The Capital Traction Company goes right by this Capitol. It has a franchise which was given to it by this Government without a dollar being paid for it by the company. The company then capitalized and valued that franchise at \$12,000,000, and last year this street-car company collected as street-car fares \$1,700,000 and declared a dividend of 6 per cent upon \$14,000,000, including \$12,000,000 of watered stock. They take the franchise given by the people to them without charge and make it a burden to be borne upon the bending backs of the people from whom it came. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

These companies are given a monopoly of the people's highway, a highway which belongs to all the citizens, a highway of the beggar as well as the street-car magnate, and yet, Mr. Speaker, these street-car companies virtually pay no taxes and not a dollar for the purpose of keeping up the streets of this city.

The Capital Traction Company has made and declared dividends amounting to over \$7,000,000 in the last ten years, and this does not take into consideration the extension of their tracks, which was paid out of their profits. They made this last year as profits off the people of this District within a hundred thousand dollars of the original cost of the 22 miles of double track which they own in this District. The Washington Electric lines, that have all the other lines trustized and monopolized in this District, collected last year off of the people \$2,879,000, and, allowing 50 per cent as operating expenses, it declared dividends of \$1,400,000, and the 50 per cent operating expenses is far more, in my judgment, than it would cost; and

I now appeal to this Congress and ask you, will you allow this outrage to go on right here in the capital of your country? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Not only that, but they go further. They pay the president of this street-car company twice as much salary as is paid to the Vice-President of the United States of America. After all of the exorbitant salaries, which are prolific, to the men high up in places, with a juggling of figures, with a concealment of profit, with a payment of interest upon debts which they do not owe, yet their dividend is so enormous absolutely that they have to add millions of water to the stock in order to keep all the people everywhere from rising up in outrageous protest against it. [Applause.]

The Capital Traction Company, which it cost in round numbers not more than \$1,500,000 to build, after adding the \$12,000,000 of watered stock, they put that stock upon the market, and it is selling to-day for \$1.40. So we see that by the exactions of this company and by the enormous and wonderful profit it makes that its stock to-day is on the open market worth close on to \$20,000,000. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt on earth that these companies can make abundant profit out of a 3-cent fare.

The legislatures of the various States, in obedience to the public will, are requiring the railroads to charge reasonable fares. Railroads that cost many times as much to operate their lines as it does a street car line, cost more to build, people are demanding that they should come down to that basis of justice of "live and let live." [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, we do not represent the people of this great city directly. They are orphaned, so far as direct representation is concerned, but on behalf of those people at home for whom we do directly speak, in their names I appeal to the manhood of this Congress to rise up and do justice to these people here, although you do not represent them directly; draw in front of the aggressions of these combinations the naked sword of American justice and in behalf of the laboring people command these companies to do common justice. [Loud applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. If the gentleman from Wisconsin desires to yield some of his time, I trust he will do so; if not, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield me some time? I wish to speak on both amendments?

Mr. BABCOCK. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SIMS. Ten minutes.

Mr. BABCOCK. I have only fourteen minutes remaining. I yield the gentleman four minutes.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Kentucky will yield me six?

Mr. JAMES. I yield six minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin yields four, making ten minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state to the House that I have worked hard for a long time to compel the street railway companies of this District to agree to universal free transfers. It was my purpose to offer such an amendment to this bill. I certainly desired to do so. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] desired to have an amendment known as the wide-tire amendment, but in order to get legislation upon that, about which there seems to be no disagreement, the gentleman from Wisconsin has agreed that the amendment for wide tires may be stricken out, and I have agreed to yield and not offer the amendment for universal free transfers. But I do believe that something ought to be done. The street railway companies will not do anything until they are forced. They did not want to furnish vestibules for their cars to save the lives of their motormen, until Congress forced them to do so. For the same reason I was not willing to advocate 3-cent fares, but inasmuch as we have been threatened by the street railway companies to litigate and test in the courts the question of universal free transfers I gave it up. Now, I wish to state a few facts, and take them from the hearings, that the House may have a clear knowledge of the condition of affairs. The gentleman from Kentucky has truthfully stated that not one cent has been paid by any street car company of the District of Columbia for the privilege of constructing and operating its railway. I can not discuss at length both of these railroad companies in the brief time I have, but inasmuch as the gentleman from Kentucky has referred to the Capital Traction Company, I will give you from the hearings the facts. Mr. Dunlop was asked what constituted the Capital Traction Company, what its properties were. I quote from the hearings:

Mr. SIMS. I want to ask you a line of questions: whether these provisions are just. What companies does the Capital Traction Company embrace? What does the title "Capital Traction Company" embrace?

Mr. DUNLOP. The Capital Traction Company is the Rock Creek Railway Company with its name changed. If you will turn to the

law of March 1, 1895, you will get the whole thing. The Capital Traction Company is simply the Rock Creek Railroad Company with the name changed by act of Congress.

Mr. SIMS. What was the capital stock of the Rock Creek Railway Company?

Mr. DUNLOP. I don't remember; I think it was about \$200,000, but you will find it in that same law; I want to answer all your questions absolutely.

Mr. SIMS. I know that; but I want to have to ask them before you answer them.

Mr. DUNLOP. The Capital Traction Company is the Rock Creek Railway Company with its name changed. The same law that authorized that authorized it to purchase the Washington and Georgetown Railway and to pay for the consideration of that purchase in stock, giving them the right to issue their stock to pay for that consideration.

Mr. SIMS. Now, I want to ask this: I think we will get along faster if we will just follow the path that I have mapped out. When you changed the name to Capital Traction, then you issued \$12,000,000 of capital stock?

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes, sir; and it was authorized by the law. Just as much as if it had been authorized in the original charter.

Mr. SIMS. You issued \$12,000,000, and then you started to float it? Mr. DUNLOP. There was no floating of it then; and there was never a dollar of cash passed in the transaction.

Mr. SIMS. Never a dollar; all stock?

Mr. DUNLOP. All stock.

Mr. SIMS. Now, when that \$12,000,000 was first issued, and put upon the market for what did it sell? I do not mean what you people exchanged between yourselves, but what was the stock worth on the market?

Mr. DUNLOP. I don't remember; it was something below par; it went down finally to 45.

Mr. SIMS. Went as low as 45?

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes; went as low as 45, and sold on our local exchange for 45.

Mr. SIMS. What is it worth now?

Mr. DUNLOP. About 141 or 142.

Mr. SIMS. Now, then, all purchases or extensions or improvements since that time have been made without any increase of the capital stock?

Mr. DUNLOP. There has never been an issue of stock; there is no law to allow us to increase; we would not attempt to do that.

Mr. SIMS. Consequently all improvements and extensions have been made out of the earnings of the road?

Mr. DUNLOP. No, sir; they have been made by the issuance of bonds.

Mr. SIMS. You have issued how much, one million?

Mr. DUNLOP. There is outstanding \$1,080,000.

Mr. SIMS. You paid in 1896, \$419,873; in 1897, \$209,000; in other words, going on down giving the different dividends; you made extensions in 1891, and your extensions were \$480,000, and sale of real estate \$558,000.

Mr. DUNLOP. That was the sale of the old powerhouse site to the Government.

Mr. SIMS. And you issued the next year as dividends amounting to \$960,000.

Mr. DUNLOP. Four hundred and eighty thousand dollars of that came from the proceeds of the sale of that lot.

Mr. SIMS. Why didn't you pay that on the bonds?

Mr. DUNLOP. Why didn't we pay that on the bonds? That was a matter for the directors to decide. I can not say why they did not pay it. It belonged to the stockholders, and they gave it to them.

Mr. SIMS. And you received \$250,000 insurance at the same time?

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMS. Why was it not paid on the bonded indebtedness?

Mr. DUNLOP. Because that was to be put into the electric system on Pennsylvania avenue.

Mr. SIMS. There has been no increase of capital, but a vast increase of value. I gather from the reports for ten years, until 1906, a few days ago, you have paid out in dividends and extensions, together with the proceeds of real estate, \$558,000, \$6,515,245.15. Your stock to-day is worth about 140.

Mr. DUNLOP. It is selling at about 141 or 142 on the exchange.

Mr. SIMS. In addition to the stockholders receiving all this amount of money and the company's extensions, amounting to about \$1,000,000, the increased value in your stock is about \$14,000,000. Now, the Capital Traction, since it was formed and started, has got in the way of profits and added value to stock more than the entire issue of stock. The CHAIRMAN. Didn't you make an error when you said \$14,000,000? It should be \$480,000.

Mr. SIMS. It went as low as 45. There was an increasing value of \$10,000,000 in the price of the stock, and they received \$6,000,000 in the way of dividends and consideration. Of course, we realize.

Mr. DUNLOP. Well, General, I think this would throw some light on that: The Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company had sold all of its property to the Rock Creek Railway Company, and went out of existence. The stockholders numbered between 180 and 200, I think. I do not think it ever was over 200, and my recollection is that at the time this took place it was about 180. The Capital Traction Company's stockholders number about 1,250, and you have the names of them in the last report.

Mr. SIMS. I don't want to get off on that.

Mr. DUNLOP. I want to get off on that because I want to disabuse your mind of one thing, that the people who own this stock now have paid a great deal.

Mr. SIMS. I do not care anything about that. I want to ask you, at the time this capital stock was issued you had of single track 35.90 miles, and of double track 17.95 miles; in other words, 18 miles of double track. Now, at \$12,000,000 the capital you issued would amount to \$666,666.66 per mile of double track. I mean when you issued it.

Mr. DUNLOP. That goes right to the question. You criticize the Rock Creek Railway Company for paying such prices.

Mr. SIMS. I only want to get at the facts. For the 18 miles of double track you issued stock at the rate of \$666,666.66 per mile.

Mr. DUNLOP. The Rock Creek Railway Company issued stock for the consideration paid to the owners of the Washington and Georgetown Railway Company, whether it was \$500 a mile or \$1,000 a mile.

Mr. SIMS. Your statement heretofore has been that it cost \$120,000 to construct double track.

Mr. DUNLOP. I looked that up since last meeting. What we built last year cost \$63,612 per mile of single track.

Mr. SIMS. But the whole construction has not cost that?

Mr. DUNLOP. I am speaking of the track construction—just what Mr. Madden said cost \$30,000, and that he had seen a contract for. And I



went further back than that. I want to get that clear in the minds of the committee. I went back and looked up all the extensions we had made under the Capital Traction Company's management, and the F and G street line and this extension out east here were \$66,000, because there were a great many more gas mains and water mains to move in the streets.

Mr. SIMS. You say it cost \$66,000. Say it cost \$150,000 per mile of double track. You have it capitalized at \$666,000 per mile of double track. How much of that is water and how much money?

Mr. DUNLOP. There is none of it water; not a drop of water in it. The Capital Traction Company paid that consideration under an act passed by Congress, and issued that stock.

Mr. SIMS. Perhaps I should not have used the word "watered." What is the difference between the capitalized value and the actual money value?

Mr. DUNLOP. The actual money value upon which it is bound to pay dividends is \$12,000,000; that is the actual value.

Mr. SIMS. Is it bound to pay dividends upon that?

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes; it is bound to pay dividends, if it makes the money. That is the money value of the present company.

Mr. SIMS. You are paying 6 per cent dividends upon that value?

Mr. DUNLOP. We are.

Mr. SIMS. And paying for all construction out of the earnings?

Mr. DUNLOP. Not at all. I just said we were issuing bonds, and if you have a report you will find that we have a floating debt this last year of \$405,000, and that really is not completed.

Mr. SIMS. But you do not contemplate increasing your capital stock to pay those bonds?

Mr. DUNLOP. No, sir; because we have no right to do it, and we do not contemplate doing anything unlawful.

Mr. SIMS. Why don't you pay the \$558,000 you got for real estate on your indebtedness, and reduce it?

Mr. DUNLOP. We paid \$480,000—not \$580,000—to the stockholders. We paid it by order of the directors.

Mr. SIMS. You received \$558,000?

Mr. DUNLOP. The balance of it was used in other matters of the company.

Mr. SIMS. You received that?

Mr. DUNLOP. Certainly we received it.

Mr. SIMS. You were carrying at least \$480,000 bonded indebtedness and you were paying 6 per cent on it, and you were paying dividends on approximately \$700,000 per mile, and then you tell this committee and this country that you can not take the little reduction that might come about by free transfers, and further acknowledge that your capital stock has enhanced in market value \$10,000,000 since shortly after—

Mr. DUNLOP. Whose stock are you talking about?

Mr. SIMS. You said it went to 45 cents.

Mr. DUNLOP. I said the present stock went down to 45.

Mr. SIMS. That was all it was worth then.

Mr. DUNLOP. Not at all.

Mr. SIMS. Then why didn't you sell the stock for what it was worth?

Mr. DUNLOP. How do I know? How does anybody know? It is worth 141 now.

Mr. SIMS. Because it brings it. Anything is worth what it will sell for.

Mr. DUNLOP. That was on the stock exchange.

Mr. SIMS. But the people sold the actual stock, didn't they?

Mr. DUNLOP. I think you will find that there was not very much sold then.

Mr. SIMS. Hasn't there been an enhanced value in the stock of your company out of all proportion—

Mr. DUNLOP. Certainly the stock has enhanced, and the interest of the stock is only 4 per cent on 150. Would you loan money at 4 per cent? I wouldn't.

Mr. SIMS. Would the price of your stock be materially reduced or affected in any way by giving free transfers?

Mr. DUNLOP. Certainly it would.

Mr. SIMS. What effect would it have?

Mr. DUNLOP. It would have the same effect as the issuing of 15,000,000 transfers has now. If we got full fares we would get greater receipts. It will affect it just to the extent that we haul passengers from all the other systems coming to us.

Mr. SIMS. But your business will increase and your receipts will increase with each passenger you carry free after a certain number.

Mr. DUNLOP. That is speculative.

Mr. SIMS. And the idea that it would reduce receipts is also speculative.

Mr. DUNLOP. I know something about that.

Mr. SIMS. Would you take less than 140 for your stock if we put on free transfers?

Mr. DUNLOP. I do not want to sell mine, for just the reason that none of you gentlemen would want to. I think I am entitled under any State law or any law in the country to reasonable compensation on that stock, and I think 6 per cent is not unreasonable. You fix 6 per cent as a point where it is not usury, and I think it is reasonable that the courts will bear me out in that.

Mr. SIMS. Isn't 4 per cent stock good stock; isn't it par everywhere?

Mr. DUNLOP. It is better than 3.

Mr. SIMS. It is practically 100 cents on the dollar?

Mr. DUNLOP. Not at all; some men would not touch it. You would not invest in 4 per cent stock, you said.

Mr. SIMS. No, sir; I said I did not have any money to lend. Now, you would not as a stockholder in your company agree to sell your stock at less than 140 if we put on free transfers?

Mr. DUNLOP. No, sir; because I have it at par and it is bearing me 6 per cent.

Mr. SIMS. You have made 4 per cent then?

Mr. DUNLOP. I have not made anything because I have not sold it.

Mr. SIMS. You have received 6 per cent?

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes; and I have also received 2 per cent.

Mr. SIMS. You have received what was allowed.

Mr. DUNLOP. You will find that we paid—

Mr. SIMS. Your stock has been improved by extension, etc.?

Mr. DUNLOP. Not at all; extensions have a tendency to draw it down.

Mr. SIMS. Are not your extensions a part of the property?

Mr. DUNLOP. Of course.

Mr. SIMS. Is 22 miles of Capital Traction worth more than 36?

Mr. DUNLOP. No; we could have made more money on the 22 than on the 36.

Mr. SIMS. Yes; you said it cost \$100,000 a mile to build it.

Mr. DUNLOP. I want to say on that point, because the public doesn't understand this any better than General Sims does, that the more miles you operate the less net profit you get out of it. We have been asking to be allowed to cover this whole District with our lines, and stand ready to build them to-day, but it would reduce our net profits if we did, and it would do away with the demand for free transfers.

Mr. SIMS. With your road as it is, will you not be able without extension, if we give free transfers, to pay your 6 per cent dividend year in and year out with the normal growth of the District?

Mr. DUNLOP. I think not, because we will simply be a dumping line for everything.

Mr. SIMS. You think your company would be injured worse than any other?

Mr. DUNLOP. I think we would be very materially injured.

Mr. SIMS. You would be very materially injured. And yet you would not sell your stock for any less than you say it is bringing now?

Mr. DUNLOP. I do not run the Capital Traction Company on my personal interest. I put that aside absolutely. I try to operate that company on business principles; if my stock didn't pay me 1 per cent I would not have anything to say.

Mr. SIMS. Because you get a salary as president?

Mr. DUNLOP. My salary is known of all men. It is in the public documents here in the Capitol. I am not ashamed of it; I earn every dollar of it. And if the stockholders do not think so, they can say so and I will get out. They pay me \$15,000 a year.

Mr. SIMS. That is the reason why I said that you can afford to be in this company, even if you did not have a share. You would not sell your stock because it carries with it something more than the dividend. Suppose you held no office in the company.

Mr. DUNLOP. It carries with it a dividend on its face value that I invested in.

Mr. SIMS. Suppose you had no office and we were going to pass a bill materially reducing the value of the stock, would you not sell your stock at present prices?

Mr. DUNLOP. If I knew you were going to pass a bill to ruin me, I would sell it to-morrow.

Mr. SIMS. But we can not injure you, as you are getting a salary, even if we allowed free transfers. But I believe, Colonel, that you can give free transfers without hurting the stockholders or salaried officers or anybody else.

Mr. DUNLOP. I disagree with you, General, from any standpoint. I think I know more about the business than you do.

Mr. SIMS. You know it better ten times than I do.

Mr. DUNLOP. And then there is the other question to which I want to call the committee's attention. As I said before, we will obey any law that Congress passes that is reasonable. We have always done it, and there need be no penalty in it to make us obey; we will do it without that; but if Congress passes an unreasonable law the courts are open to us.

Mr. SIMS. They ought to be open to you.

Mr. DUNLOP. They ought to be, and I think there is not one gentleman at this table who will deny it. If you pass a law loading us up with free transfers, no one here will deny that we will have a right to go to the courts. But I want to say that there is another question involved there, the right to make any corporation or individual carry a passenger or do any other kind of work without reward. The free transfer means that we must carry those passengers without reward. That question will go to the courts.

Mr. SIMS. The reason I have asked you so much about your own company is because I can not understand the reports of the other companies at all, but I can understand yours.

Mr. DUNLOP. We make everything so that any man can understand. We have nothing to hide, gentlemen, and I want to say here that we make money, too.

Mr. SIMS. Your reports show it.

Mr. DUNLOP. We do not deny it.

Mr. SIMS. But for the franchises—

Mr. DUNLOP. For the franchises we hold the receipts of the District government at 4 per cent.

Mr. SIMS. It is the lowest tax on the face of the earth.

Mr. DUNLOP. The lowest tax on the face of the earth?

Mr. SIMS. The lowest that I have heard of to call it tax. I do not think that it would be reasonable to call it tax if it were any lower.

Mr. DUNLOP. That is your private opinion.

Mr. SIMS. It is about 30 cents per \$100 on the selling value of the stock.

Mr. DUNLOP. You are getting into stock; I am not a stock dealer.

Mr. SIMS. It is good property with or without free transfers, and it will be 200 one of these days, and the reason of it is because the city is growing.

Mr. DUNLOP. I want to tell this committee now that if I can make it worth 500 I am going to do it, and you do it, too, at home.

Mr. SIMS. You are looking at it from a salary standpoint, while we are looking at it from the standpoint of the good of the people. When will the day come that your company will be willing to give something in the way of reduced fares?

Mr. DUNLOP. Never. If Congress opens the way to us and says that we can build out to the sections that are clamoring for the car lines it will do away with the demand for free transfers.

Now, I will not read it all, because it is too long. But here is the Capital Traction Company, that, as shown by the statements of its president, was simply the Rock Creek Company with its name changed. The Rock Creek Company had \$200,000 of capital stock. The name was changed and stock reissued for \$12,000,000. The hearings show that only 18 miles of double track then existed. Five miles of that double track was overhead construction, which cost only half the cost of underground. The capitalization, as is thus shown, was \$666,000 per mile. Not a dollar was added to the treasury, not an additional dollar put in. Then the power house, or the lot upon which it stood, was sold. The Government bought it, because it was cheap, at over \$550,000, and instead of the company then paying its bonded indebtedness of \$1,000,000 then existing, it put \$480,000 in the pockets of its stockholders as an extra dividend. The capital stock has advanced from 45 cents on the dollar, market value, to \$1.47 on the dollar, for which it sold to-day, making

more than \$10,000,000 in profits by advancement of stock. Over \$6,000,000 in dividends have been paid, until the enhanced value of stock and dividends exceed every dollar ever put into the treasury of the company by way of investment. And yet they say they will not have free transfers—they will not do something for nothing. When I asked Mr. Dunlop if free transfers would reduce the value of the stock materially he said yes. I asked him if he would sell his at the present market value in case the law passed, and he said he would not. I said to him, "Your stock is a good property, and it will go to 200." He said, "I will make it 500 if I can."

This shows the spirit of those who own and conduct these roads, and here are the facts. This House is as capable of judging whether they can carry passengers for 3 cents as I am. The proof shows that the highest cost of underground construction has never exceeded \$60,000 per single mile, or \$120,000 for a double track of underground construction, and it is capitalized at \$666,000 per mile, including overhead and underground construction, besides having built all new construction out of earnings or without additional issue of stock. These are the facts briefly stated, but not fully stated, as to the railway proposition.

Now, as to the smoke amendment. The terminal company came to Congress last session and asked for a law to permit them to acquire additional real estate at the terminal station by way of condemnation. Upon that bill was ingrafted the smoke amendment, which I had the honor to offer, simply making the steam railways subject to the same law that every other interest and every individual in the District is now subject. One concern, the Washington Traction Railway Company, has paid \$5,000 in fines for violating that law. The people of this District stood at the doors of the District Committee for years to get the law repealed or modified. Congress has stood firm on it, and at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars every individual and industry in the District of Columbia has been forced to accept this law, while every steam railroad that runs through the District of Columbia can run its engines through the District burning soft coal or anything else, and smoking up the city. The railway engines make more smoke than all the other industries in the District combined. What a farce to require everybody else to obey the law and let go scot-free the railways. There is the great Union Station, toward which the Government has paid by way of cash and real-estate contributions more than \$5,000,000—that, taken in connection with the fact that the railways have occupied public property—the Mall—for more than thirty years without paying one single cent of rental, and without even paying taxes. The Government gave them the Long Bridge, and with it the contract that they should maintain the highway part in perpetuity—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, could I get two minutes in which to finish the statement?

Mr. BABCOCK. I have no more time, I am sorry to say.

Mr. SIMS. I am right in the midst of a statement which is not complete. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asks unanimous consent for three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. I thank the House for the opportunity to finish this statement, which will have to be hurried. This company was bound to keep that highway bridge in repair in perpetuity. But an act of Congress relieved them and built a new highway bridge at the expense of the District and the nation. This company is now occupying public property, and have charged every other railroad entering here for the use of terminals that they have absolutely free except the cost of the buildings. I have before me the ordinance of New York City, and this same railway company pays to the city of New York for the privilege of going under her streets \$75,000 a year for the first ten years and \$225,000 for the next fifteen years, with the power to readjust after that time, as I am informed by a gentleman from New York. They are spending in the neighborhood of \$100,000,000 in construction of tunnels under East River and North River and through the city. The New York ordinance provides that they must use electricity. We do not provide that they shall use any particular method of preventing smoke, but leave it alone to them. Is this House by its vote going to say that the railroad property of this country is a pet, a select and special favorite, and that these companies shall not be held to the observance of the same law to which every other property holder of the city is subject?

Now, before the tracks are laid, before the plans are executed, is the time to legislate. After its tracks are laid, the plans executed, then if we should undertake to do what we are doing by this bill they will say they constructed their terminals as pro-

vided by Congress and now it would be unjust and inequitable to force them to change their construction after completion. We give them to January, 1908, to prepare to obey the law. If they will only make an effort, and it shall appear that they have not had sufficient time, I am confident Congress will give them an extension of time if necessary. Is New York City to be held up to this country as a model, where a single board of aldermen act, while the great Congress of the United States, in its own Capitol, allows them to dig a tunnel under Capitol Hill, spoiling the street in front of the finest building on earth, absolutely free, and allow them to smoke up and ruin these fine buildings simply because it will cost them something to prevent the nuisance? [Loud applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the bill is to be read, the point of order which I would make would come immediately after the reading of the section to which the point of order is to be made, but if the bill is not to be read, I would ask the Chair whether it is not in order now to make the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The rule has not yet been adopted.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky has not yet been offered.

The SPEAKER. Well, the rule has not been passed, and the gentleman from Kentucky can not offer the amendment until the vote is taken on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the order.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it rarely happens that important legislation meets the wishes of us all in every particular. There are some features of this proposed legislation that do not meet my approval.

I would like to have Congress at this time give notice to the railroads entering the city of Washington that in a reasonable time they will be expected and required to bring their trains into the city with electrical engines or by some power that will avoid the smoke nuisance.

We know from what has already transpired that the railroads will oppose this proposition, but there is no good reason to be given in opposition except the question of expense.

The New York Central and Hudson River Railroad is using electrical engines at their terminals in New York City by means of the third rail. They now have thirty-five electrical engines, and this new method of moving their trains in and out of the city seems to be a decided success.

I am told that we have appropriated between twelve and fifteen millions of dollars for white marble buildings that are being or are soon to be erected in this city. Is not this the time and place to take the precaution and give notice to the railroads entering the city that we feel that they ought to join with us in sparing no efforts to preserve these beautiful buildings from the discoloration that will surely come to them in a short time if the smoke trouble is not abated?

I desire to spend just a moment upon the amendment with reference to 3-cent fares. A few days ago this House passed a bill fixing the rate of fare for a suburban railroad desiring to enter this city at 3 cents. If there is a gentleman within the sound of my voice here to-night that knows where in the financial markets of this or any other country you can get money to build a suburban railroad with a 3-cent fare, I would like to have that gentleman stand up now.

Gentlemen, we are asked by an amendment to this bill to say that the electric railroads in the city of Washington shall charge only 3 cents. I wish for one that it were possible to do so—perhaps it is. Knowing, as we all do, that the underground system here costs much more than it does in the most of the cities, where the overhead system is used, and where in many cities a straight 5-cent fare is charged, and in some cases six tickets sold for a quarter, as they are here, I do not feel at this time that I can give my vote to the 3-cent proposition without some additional light. I think so important a matter should receive further and more careful consideration and that we should move cautiously at this time.

My judgment is that the people are not complaining so much about the rate of fare and universal transfers as they are about the want of cars and the lack of proper service. [Applause.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when the proposition was made to suspend the rules and pass this bill I was opposed to that action not because of the provisions of the bill, but because an opportunity was not given to secure certain amendments that I thought ought to be engrafted upon the bill. I am in favor of the passage of the bill, but I am confident that its merits can be enhanced by the adoption of the amendment



to be proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. It has been suggested that this amendment, providing for universal 3-cent fares and prohibiting the collection of fare from any passenger who is not furnished with a seat, is untimely, that this is not the fit occasion for its consideration.

I am free to admit, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been better that there should have been ample time for the discussion of this question; that there should have been hearings, and that all of the facts beyond dispute should have been brought to the attention of the House; but, Mr. Speaker, if that has not been done, it is not the fault of those who favor this amendment. [Applause.] We have sought opportunity time and again to engraft amendments upon the legislation that would compel, upon the part of the owners of these franchises within the District, some attention to be paid to the interests of the people of this District. Mr. Speaker, I am not able to prove to the satisfaction of this House that a 3-cent fare will be remunerative to all of the roads that are interested in this subject, but I have no doubt that every Member of this House, from the ample information that we now have, is satisfied that to one of the great street railway corporations a 3-cent fare would be remunerative and will enable them to pay fit and proper dividends upon their stock, watered as it is.

The other corporation, the Washington Electric, consists, I think, of thirteen distinct corporations. Five of the roads owned by that company, and consolidated under this new name, are remunerative roads. The other eight perhaps to-day are not, but, Mr. Speaker, remember they have cost this corporation next to nothing. They have but little real investment in those roads, which have been built largely out of bonds. The capitalization of this Washington Electric Company amounts to about \$229,000 for each mile of single track. Forty-two miles of single track they own and now operate, and their lines have been built out of the bonds that they have issued, and the stock has cost the present proprietors nothing, as I am informed. So that if they do not secure the ample dividends immediately that will in five or six years raise the price of their stock from forty-five to one hundred and forty-seven, they can afford to wait. They will not be out anything.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is within the knowledge of all the membership of this House that the people of this District are not furnished with those proper facilities for comfortable riding that it is their right to demand. It is my fortune very frequently to be compelled to take, between the hours of 4 and 6 o'clock, a car near the Library building. On all of the occasions but four or five since I came into this city nearly four months ago, when I have attempted to use that road, I have been compelled to stand. On one occasion I counted the passengers who overloaded the car that I was in. Twenty-four persons were sitting, nineteen persons were standing between the seats, twelve persons were on the rear platform, and one passenger was on the front platform. Here was a much larger number of men and women who were compelled to pay their fares who were not provided with seats than those who had seats. In my humble judgment, it is a crime, it is a robbery for these corporations to compel men and women to pay for a comfortable ride and then habitually refuse to furnish it. [Applause.]

So it is that I most heartily favor the adoption of this amendment that makes it a crime, punishable under the law, for any of their servants to demand, with threats, from a reluctant passenger compensation for that which the company habitually refuses to give to its customers. We are in their power; we can not help ourselves. They can say, "Walk, if you do not want to ride." There are some people that can not walk, that need to ride, that need these rights, that are entitled to them, and that are willing to pay for them, and I insist that they ought to be permitted to have them.

One gentleman sneeringly said, a little while ago, "Is there any provision in this bill to compel these corporations to carry passengers for nothing?" and seemed to think that the friends of the measure had been derelict because they had not incorporated such a provision. Another gentleman in my hearing sneeringly said, "Do you propose to shoot or hang the president?" Ah, no, Mr. Speaker, no one wants either to shoot or to hang; no one wants to compel them to perform a service for nothing. All that the people in this District want, all that the friends of this measure want, is to compel these corporations that have received these franchises without the payment of a cent when they come to Congress asking for other franchises, asking for still greater facilities, asking for other opportunities to build railroads out of the bonds and to issue stock for which they do not pay, at least to give those facilities which

common honesty and common decency require that they should give. [Applause.]

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in answer to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. It is not a question of bonds or stocks or capital. During the last year the cost of each passenger carried by the Capital Traction Company was 2½ cents; on the other line, the Washington Electric, 2.56 cents. This was the actual operating expenses; it did not include taxes, it did not include interest on bonds, it did not include dividends, and if you pass this provision for a 3-cent fare, it means confiscation. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time and ask for a vote.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman answer me a question before he yields?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Has any man, under the solemnity of an oath, made the statements that the gentleman repeated here? [Applause.]

Mr. BABCOCK. These statements made to the House are made under oath.

Mr. HEPBURN. I should like to cross-examine for half an hour the man that dares to make that statement. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and agreeing to the order.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the order was agreed to.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, is not the bill to be read?

Mr. BABCOCK. The bill has been read in the House two or three times.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with and that the gentleman from Mississippi be allowed to make his point of order now.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the City and Suburban Railway of Washington be, and it hereby is, authorized and required to construct a double-track extension of its lines from New Jersey avenue and G street NW. eastwardly to and along Massachusetts avenue with such northerly deviation as may be necessary to bring the tracks immediately in front of and adjacent to the main entrance to the Union Station to junctions with the existing tracks at Third and D streets NE. and at the northwest corner of Stanton square; also to extend its double tracks on North Capitol street southwardly from the intersection of G street to Massachusetts avenue to connect with the tracks of the City and Suburban Railway of Washington, hereinafter authorized.

Sec. 2. That the Washington Railway and Electric Company be, and it hereby is, authorized and required to construct a double-track extension of its line from Delaware avenue and C street NE. northeastwardly along Delaware avenue to Massachusetts avenue, there to connect with the tracks of the City and Suburban Railway of Washington, hereinafter authorized; also a double-track loop on the Union Station plaza connecting with the four tracks provided for in section 6: *Provided*, That existing transfer arrangements between the Washington Railway and Electric Company and the Metropolitan Coach Company, a corporation of the District of Columbia, shall not be terminated except by authority of Congress; and, unless said Metropolitan Coach Company shall within one year after the passage of this act substitute motor vehicles to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the heretics now used by it, its right to operate its line shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That all transfers issued by the Metropolitan Coach Company shall be properly dated and punched as to time limit, and that unless said transfers are so dated and punched the Washington Railway and Electric Company shall not be required to receive them: *And provided further*, That the aforesaid companies are hereby required within one year after the completion of the work herein authorized, to remove their respective tracks from the following streets and after their removal to repave the space now occupied by said tracks to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, namely: G street NW. from North Capitol street to New Jersey avenue; C street north from First street east to Fourth street east; First street east from C street north to D street north; D street north from First street east to Massachusetts avenue; First street west from C street north to G street north; Sixth street west from Louisiana avenue to B street north; and Louisiana avenue from Fifth street west to Sixth street west; and upon neglect or refusal of said companies to remove their respective tracks and to repave said space to the satisfaction of the said Commissioners within the time above limited said companies shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be subject to the penalty provided in section 710 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, regarding the removal of abandoned tracks, and said Commissioners are authorized to remove said tracks and to repave the space occupied by same and charge the cost thereof to such railway company, and the same shall be collected as provided in section 5 of the act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia approved June 11, 1878.

Sec. 3. That the Capital Traction Company of the District of Columbia be, and it hereby is, authorized and required to construct a double-track extension of its lines from C street and Delaware avenue NE. northeastwardly along Delaware avenue to the plaza in front of the proposed Union Station, together with a double-track loop passing in front of the station on said plaza, connecting with the four tracks provided for in section 6 and northwestwardly along Massachusetts avenue to Fourth street NW., there to connect with the existing tracks of the Washington Railway and Electric Company and thence over those tracks (under intercompany agreement) to Seventh and K streets NW., there to connect with the existing Seventh street tracks of said Capital Traction Company; also a double-track extension of its lines beginning

at Florida avenue and Seventh street NW., running eastwardly along Florida avenue to its intersection with Eighth street east, thence along Eighth street to its intersection with said company's tracks at Pennsylvania avenue SE.; also a double-track extension beginning at the intersection of Eighth and F streets NE., westwardly on said F street to Second street east, thence to connect by such route as may be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with the double-track loop hereinbefore mentioned.

SEC. 4. That the companies hereinbefore named be, and they hereby are, permitted to lay duct lines on such streets as may be necessary for the proper operation of their lines, the location of such duct lines to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. That the construction of the aforesaid street railway lines shall be commenced within six months and completed within eighteen months from the date of the passage of this act; and in default of such commencement or completion within the time in this section specified, all rights, franchises, and privileges granted by this act shall immediately cease and determine.

SEC. 6. That where the route or routes provided for in this act coincide with each other or with the route or routes of existing street railways or street railways hereafter authorized to be operated or constructed, one set of tracks shall be used in common, upon terms mutually agreed upon, or, in case of disagreement, upon terms determined by the supreme court of the District of Columbia, which is authorized and directed to give hearing to the interested parties, and to fix the terms of the joint trackage: *Provided*, That there shall be at least two sets of double tracks immediately in front of the main entrance to the Union Station facing Massachusetts avenue, the most northerly rail being not more than 50 feet south of the said main entrance.

SEC. 7. That the railway companies affected by this act shall have over and respecting the routes herein provided for the same rights, powers, and privileges as they respectively have or hereafter may have by law over and respecting their other routes and shall be subject in respect thereto to all the other provisions of their charters and of law.

SEC. 8. That authority is hereby given the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use such portions of reservation 77 as may, in their judgment, be necessary for sidewalks and roadways and for street railway use. And authority is hereby given the Commissioners to acquire by purchase or to condemn in accordance with existing law for street purposes so much of square 626 lying north of the north building line of square 567 extended as they may deem necessary, and the cost of acquiring said property as above shall be paid by the City and Suburban Railway of Washington: *Provided*, That where a portion of any lot is authorized to be acquired as above the said Commissioners may, in their discretion, acquire the entire lot; the portion thereof, when so acquired, lying south of the north building line of square 567 extended to become the property of the said City and Suburban Railway of Washington so soon as the entire costs of acquisition as above specified shall be paid by it.

SEC. 9. That whenever, in the construction of the new tracks herein authorized, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia deem it necessary, in order to reasonably accommodate vehicular traffic, to widen the roadway of any street or streets in which such track or tracks are to be laid, the cost and expense of such widening, including the laying of new sidewalks, the adjustment of all underground construction, and of every public appurtenance, shall be borne by the said railway company, and the said railway company shall deposit with the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia the estimated cost of changing and widening the said street or streets, the work to be done by said Commissioners; and whenever, at any future time, the said Commissioners deem it necessary to widen the roadway of any street or streets occupied by the extensions herein authorized said railway company shall bear one-half the cost of widening and improving such street or streets, to be collected in the same manner as the cost of laying or repairing pavement lying between the exterior rails of the tracks of said street railroad and for a distance of 2 feet exterior to such track or tracks is collectible under the provisions of section 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia," approved June 11, 1878.

SEC. 10. That whenever in the construction of any of the tracks herein authorized it is necessary, in the opinion of the Commissioners, to improve, by paving or otherwise, the roadway of any street occupied by such track or tracks, said company shall adjust the grade of its tracks to the new grade of the street or streets, the cost thereof to be borne by said company in the same manner as the cost of paving between the exterior of the tracks of the street railroad companies, as referred to in the preceding section.

SEC. 11. That the arrangement of all tracks herein authorized within the lines of the plaza in front of the Union Railroad Station shall be in accordance with the plans approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and all work of constructing the extensions herein authorized shall be executed in accordance with plans to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and under a permit or permits by the said Commissioners.

SEC. 12. That on and after January 1, 1908, the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 2, 1899, entitled "An act for the prevention of smoke in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," shall be, and are hereby, extended to apply to any and all steam locomotive engines of any description used on any steam railroad within the District of Columbia; and any officer, agent, or employee of any individual, firm, or corporation operating any steam locomotive engine or any steam railroad within the District of Columbia from the smokestack of which engine shall issue or be emitted dense or thick black or gray smoke or cluders after the date above mentioned shall be deemed and held guilty of creating a public nuisance and violating the provisions of said act.

SEC. 13. That from and after the 1st day of January, 1908, every wagon or other vehicle of whatsoever kind or description weighing, when loaded, more than 2 tons exclusive of the weight of the vehicle, used, operated, or propelled on, over, or across any of the streets, avenues, alleys, bridges, or roadways of the District of Columbia, shall have wheel tires not less than 4 inches broad. Any owner or driver or other person in control of such wagon or other vehicle so using, operating, or propelling the same who shall violate the provisions of this section, shall, on conviction thereof in the police court of the District of Columbia, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$25, or by imprisonment for not more than sixty days, or both.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is a Senate bill with a House amendment, and that section 13 is not germane to the subject-matter of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk completed the reading of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 14. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

SEC. 15. That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add a new section as follows:

"That from and after the passage of this act the rate of fare that may be charged for the transportation of passengers over any and all street railway lines in the District of Columbia shall not exceed 3 cents, good for one continuous transportation of one passenger over the whole or any part of the line of said street railway company over which tickets are sold; and all conductors or other persons are hereby prohibited from demanding or receiving a fare or ticket from any passenger who is not provided with a seat.

"For a violation of any of the provisions of this section such company or other person violating the same shall be subject to a fine of \$500 for each offense."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PERKINS. Can I demand a division of the amendment, so that a vote shall be taken on a portion of the amendment which provides for 3-cent fares and a separate vote on the amendment forbidding the collection of fares unless the passenger is provided with a seat? If so, I demand such a division.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would say that under the rule it is provided that the amendment shall be offered as a whole. The order specifically stated it to be one proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] demands a division of the question. It seems to the Chair, after examining the amendment with some care, that there are two propositions.

Mr. PERKINS. I demand a division, Mr. Speaker, that the vote be taken on the question of the 3-cent fare first, and, second, the vote on the question refusing to allow any charge where a seat is not furnished.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first proposition as the Chair has marked it.

The Clerk read as follows:

"That from and after the passage of this act the rate of fare that may be charged for the transportation of passengers over any and all street-railway lines in the District of Columbia shall not exceed 3 cents, good for one continuous transportation of one passenger over the whole or any part of the line of said street railway company over which tickets are sold.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, allow me to suggest to the Chair that the question is not divisible, for the reason that the penalty that is to be found at the end of the second part applies to both of these prohibitions.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that the consistency or wisdom of either or both propositions is not with the Chair. The only question is, Are there two propositions to be separated? and the Chair finds that there are.

Mr. HEPBURN. But, Mr. Speaker, how can there be two distinct propositions divided as the Chair proposes to divide them?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first one and then read the other.

Mr. HEPBURN. But the penalty applies to the first one as well as to the other.

The SPEAKER. After all, the continuity or the wisdom of the proposition is not to be passed upon by the Chair. The only question is whether there are two propositions, so that if one is taken away there would remain a substantive proposition, and the Chair finds there are two. The Clerk has reported the first one, and the question is now on the motion to insert the proposition read.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands the yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the demand for the yeas and nays.

The question was again taken; and on a division, there were—yeas 114, nays 103.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I now demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.



The question was taken; and there were—yeas 141, nays 102, answered "present" 8, not voting 126, as follows:

## YEAS—141.

Adamson	Esch	Knopf	Robinson, Ark.
Alken	Finley	Lamar	Rodenberg
Bankhead	Flood	Lamb	Rucker
Bartlett	Fordney	Landis, Chas. B.	Russell
Beall, Tex.	Foster, Vt.	Landis, Frederick	Ryan
Bell, Ga.	French	Lee	Shackleford
Birdsall	Fulkerson	Legare	Sheppard
Bowers	Gaines, Tenn.	Lever	Sherley
Brantley	Garrett	Lewis	Sims
Brumm	Gilham	Lloyd	Slayden
Brundidge	Gillespie	McKinney	Small
Burke, S. Dak.	Glass	McLain	Smith, Ill.
Burleson	Goldfogle	McNary	Smith, Ky.
Burnett	Graft	Macon	Smith, Tex.
Burton, Del.	Granger	Martin	Smyser
Calder	Gregg	Moon, Tenn.	Southall
Candler	Hale	Mouser	Southard
Chaney	Hamilton	Murdock	Steenerson
Chapman	Hay	Murphy	Stephens, Tex.
Clark, Mo.	Heflin	Nelson	Sterling
Clayton	Hepburn	Otjen	Sullivan
Cocks	Hill, Miss.	Overstreet, Ga.	Sulzer
Cooper, Wis.	Hinshaw	Padgett	Taylor, Ala.
Cromer	Houston	Page	Thomas, N. C.
Crumpacker	Howard	Patterson, N. C.	Trimble
Cushman	Howell, N. J.	Patterson, S. C.	Trimble
Davey, La.	Hubbard	Pearre	Wallace
Dawson	Humphrey, Wash.	Perkins	Watkins
De Armond	Humphreys, Miss.	Pou	Webb
Dickson, Ill.	Hunt	Powers	Wharton
Dixon, Ind.	James	Prince	Williams
Dixon, Mont.	Jones, Wash.	Rainey	Willson
Driscoll	Kelher	Randell, Tex.	Zenor
Edwards	Kennedy, Ohio	Reynolds	
Ellerbe	Kinkaid	Richardson, Ala.	
Ellis	Knap	Riordan	

## NAYS—102.

Alexander	Draper	Law	Reyburn
Allen, Me.	Dunwell	Lawrence	Ruppert
Allen, N. J.	Englebright	Littauer	Schneebell
Andrus	Fassett	Littlefield	Scott
Babcock	Fitzgerald	Longworth	Shartell
Barchfeld	Fletcher	Lorimer	Sherman
Bates	Foss	Loud	Sibley
Bede	Fowler	Loudenslager	Smith, Md.
Bennet, N. Y.	Gaines, W. Va.	Lovering	Smith, Mich.
Bonyne	Gardner, Mass.	Lowden	Snapp
Brick	Gardner, N. J.	McCreary, Pa.	Sperry
Brooks, Colo.	Graham	McKinley, Ill.	Stevens, Minn.
Burke, Pa.	Greene	McMorran	Sulloway
Burleigh	Grosvenor	Mahon	Tawney
Burton, Ohio	Haskins	Mann	Taylor, Ohio
Campbell, Kans.	Hayes	Marshall	Wadsworth
Capron	Henry, Conn.	Miller	Waldo
Cassel	Higgins	Moore, Pa.	Wanger
Cole	Hill, Conn.	Mudd	Washburn
Cooper, Pa.	Howell, Utah	Needham	Weeks
Currier	Kahn	Norris	Weems
Dalzell	Kelley	Olcott	Wiley, N. J.
Davidson	Kennedy, Nebr.	Parker	Wood
Dawes	Knowland	Parsons	Woodyard
Deemer	Lacey	Payne	
Denby	Lafean	Reeder	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Goulden	Hull	Kilne	Meyer
Hughes	Jenkins	Maynard	Townsend

## NOT VOTING—126.

Acheson	Davis, W. Va.	Klepper	Roberts
Ames	Dover	Le Fevre	Robertson, La.
Bannon	Dresser	Lilley, Conn.	Samuel
Bartholdt	Dwight	Lilley, Pa.	Saunders
Beldler	Field	Lindsay	Scroggy
Bennett, Ky.	Floyd	Livingston	Slemp
Bingham	Foster, Ind.	McCall	Smith, Cal.
Blshop	Fuller	McCarthy	Smith, Iowa
Blackburn	Garber	McCleary, Minn.	Smith, Pa.
Boutell	Gardner, Mich.	McDermott	Southwick
Bowersock	Garner	McGavin	Sparkman
Bowie	Gilbert	McKinlay, Cal.	Splight
Bradley	Gill	McLachlan	Stafford
Brooks, Tex.	Gillet	Madden	Stanley
Broussard	Goebel	Michalek	Talbot
Brown	Griggs	Minor	Thomas, Ohio
Brownlow	Gronna	Mondell	Tirrell
Buckman	Gudger	Moon, Pa.	Towne
Burgess	Hardwick	Moore, Tex.	Tyndall
Butler, Pa.	Haugen	Morrell	Underwood
Butler, Tenn.	Hearst	Nevin	Van Duzer
Byrd	Hedge	Olmsted	Van Winkle
Calderhead	Henry, Tex.	Overstreet, Ind.	Vreeland
Campbell, Ohio	Hermann	Palmer	Wachter
Clark, Fla.	Hogg	Pollard	Watson
Cockran	Holliday	Pujo	Webber
Conner	Hopkins	Ransdell, La.	Weisse
Coudrey	Huff	Rhodes	Welborn
Cousins	Johnson	Rhodes	Wiley, Ala.
Dale	Jones, Va.	Richardson, Ky.	Young
Darragh	Kitchin, Claude	Rives	
Davis, Minn.	Kitchin, Wm. W.		

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the vote:

Mr. CONNER with Mr. PUJO.

Mr. HULL with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. SPARKMAN.  
Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. WILEY of Alabama.  
Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. KLINE.  
Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. MAYNARD.  
Mr. WACHTER with Mr. MEYER.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Until further notice:

Mr. GRONNA with Mr. HENRY of Texas.  
Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. UNDERWOOD.  
Mr. JENKINS with Mr. CLARK of Florida.  
Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania with Mr. GARNER.  
Mr. WATSON with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.  
Mr. BARTHOLOLT with Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia.  
Mr. COUSINS with Mr. GILL.  
Mr. DARRAGH with Mr. GUDGER.  
Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. TOWNE.  
Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.  
Mr. THOMAS of Ohio with Mr. SPIGHT.  
Mr. TIRRELL with Mr. SAUNDERS.

The result of the vote was announced as above reported. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The SPEAKER. The Speaker must admonish the galleries not to applaud. The Clerk will report the remainder of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

And all conductors or other persons are hereby prohibited from demanding or receiving a fare or ticket from any passenger who is not provided with a seat. For a violation of any of the provisions of this section such company or other person violating the same shall be subject to a fine of \$500 for each offense.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the House understands they are voting now on the whole substitute reported by the committee as amended.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Has it not been passed on by a ye-and-nay vote?

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia as amended.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. JAMES. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 141, noes 91.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JAMES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid upon the table.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 5951. An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 25851) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

## GENERAL DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 25851, the general deficiency bill, and ask unanimous consent to disagree to the amendments of the Senate and ask for a conference.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, there are some amendments we would like to concur in. I object, unless we will be allowed to make a motion to concur.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended, the bill be taken from the Speaker's table, the amendments be disagreed to, a conference asked, and the Speaker be directed to appoint conferees without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] moves that the rules be suspended and that the bill be taken from the Speaker's table, amendments be disagreed to, and that a conference be asked, and that the Chair be directed to appoint conferees without intervening motion. Is a second demanded?

A second was not demanded.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. LITTAUER, Mr. TAWNEY, and Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

## CURRENCY BILL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 13566, with Senate amendments, which were read.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments, and upon that motion I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey moves to concur in the Senate amendments, and on that motion demands the previous question.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAMES. I want to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky has not the floor for that purpose. The gentleman from New Jersey has the floor and has moved to concur in the Senate amendments, and upon that motion demands the previous question.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] desires to offer a motion which has precedence of that. He calls for the regular order. The regular order is that this bill go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. What would send it there? How does the regular order send it there?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman makes the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not the floor for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now make the motion.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman from Mississippi has not the floor for that purpose. The gentleman from New Jersey took the floor, was recognized, moved to concur in the Senate amendments, and upon that motion demands the previous question; and until that is voted down the gentleman can not obtain the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does or does not a motion to send this bill to the committee have precedence of the motion to concur? And if it have precedence, does the fact that the motion to concur has been made cut off its precedence? In other words, can a rule of the House be violated merely by a recognition?

The SPEAKER. There is no rule of the House as the gentleman seems to think. It is perfectly plain. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER], the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, rose in his place and addressed the Chair, and moved that the House do concur in the Senate amendments, and upon that motion demands the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] also rose in his place and was attempting to get recognition from the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Two gentlemen can not be recognized at the same time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that, of course.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, under usage and custom, was entitled to recognition and can not be taken off his feet until the House takes him off.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A gentleman can not be taken off his feet except in one way, and a gentleman can always be taken off his feet in that way. Whenever any gentleman on his feet makes a motion, and another gentleman rises and makes a motion which has precedence of that motion in connection with the bill which is sent in from the Senate, a House bill with a Senate amendment, then a motion to send it to the committee charged by this House with the consideration of the subject-matter is a motion having precedence, and it being a motion having precedence, the gentleman who has made a motion not having precedence can be taken off his feet by the Member making a motion having precedence.

The SPEAKER. Now, as to the question of fact. The motion of the gentleman from New Jersey is in order, and he can not be taken off his feet by a motion to refer to a committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. No such motion was made. The gentleman from Georgia simply demanded the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is the regular order.

Mr. SHERMAN. He made no motion.

The SPEAKER. No such motion was made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But this is the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi and all gentlemen will please be in order.

Mr. JAMES. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAMES. I want to know if a motion to concur in a Senate amendment to a House bill with an amendment does not have precedence over a motion to concur?

The SPEAKER. It would if the gentleman from New Jersey had not demanded the previous question.

Mr. JAMES. But before he demanded the previous question I was on my feet. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman might be on his feet, but parliamentarily he is not upon his feet until he is recognized by the Chair. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAMES. That may be.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Should not this Senate amendment under the rule require consideration in Committee of the Whole, or else does it not have to be referred to the committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not aware of anything in it that requires consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I desire to call the attention of the Speaker to the language of the bill, which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue notes under certain contingencies. That involves expense or a charge upon the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter of argument or speculation. But even if it were correct, the point of order having not been made until the gentleman makes the motion and demands the previous question, it would come too late. But it is not necessary to decide that matter. The point of order was not made; and the gentleman from New Jersey makes a motion which is in order, and upon that demands the previous question.

The question was taken on ordering the previous question; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 175, noes 100.

Mr. LEWIS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 84, answered "present" 2, not voting 127, as follows:

## YEAS—164.

Alexander	Draper	Kennedy, Nebr.	Pearre
Allen, Me.	Driscoll	Kennedy, Ohio	Perkins
Allen, N. J.	Dunwell	Kinkaid	Powers
Andrus	Edwards	Knapp	Prince
Babcock	Ellis	Knopf	Reeder
Barchfeld	Englebright	Knowland	Reynolds
Bates	Esch	Lacey	Samuel
Bede	Fassett	Lafean	Scott
Bennet, N. Y.	Fletcher	Landis, Chas. B.	Shartel
Birdsall	Fordney	Landis, Frederick	Sherman
Bonyne	Foss	Law	Sibley
Brick	Foster, Vt.	Littauer	Smith, Ill.
Brooks, Colo.	Fowler	Littlefield	Smith, Iowa
Burke, S. Dak.	French	Longworth	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Fulkerson	Lorimer	Smith, Pa.
Burton, Del.	Gaines, W. Va.	Loud	Smyser
Burton, Ohio	Gardner, Mass.	Loudenslager	Snapp
Calder	Gardner, Mich.	Loving	Southard
Calderhead	Gardner, N. J.	Lowden	Sperry
Campbell, Kans.	Gilham	McCreary, Pa.	Steenerson
Capron	Graft	McKinley, Ill.	Sterling
Cassel	Graham	McKinney	Stevens, Minn.
Chaney	Greene	McMorran	Sulloway
Chapman	Gronna	Mahon	Tawney
Cocks	Grosvenor	Mann	Taylor, Ohio
Cole	Hale	Marshall	Townsend
Conner	Hamilton	Martin	Volstead
Cooper, Pa.	Haskins	Miller	Vreeland
Cousins	Hayes	Mondell	Wadsworth
Cromer	Henry, Conn.	Moore, Pa.	Waldo
Crumppacker	Hepburn	Mouser	Wanger
Currier	Higgins	Mudd	Washburn
Cushman	Hill, Conn.	Murdock	Watson
Dalzell	Hinshaw	Murphy	Weeks
Darragh	Howell, N. J.	Needham	Weems
Davidson	Hubbard	Norris	Wharton
Dawes	Hull	Olcott	Wiley, N. J.
Dawson	Humphrey, Wash.	Otjen	Wilson
Deemer	Jones, Wash.	Parker	Wood
Denby	Kahn	Parsons	Woodyard
Dixon, Mont.	Keifer	Payne	

## NAYS—84.

Adamson	Burnett	Fitzgerald	Heflin
Aiken	Candler	Flood	Hill, Miss.
Bartlett	Clark, Mo.	Gaines, Tenn.	Houston
Beall, Tex.	Clayton	Garrett	Howard
Bell, Ga.	Cooper, Wis.	Gill	Humphreys, Miss.
Brantley	De Armond	Gillespie	Hunt
Brumm	Dixon, Ind.	Glass	James
Brundidge	Ellerbe	Gregg	Kelifer
Burleson	Finley	Hay	Kline



Lamar  
Lamb  
Lee  
Legare  
Lever  
Lewis  
Lloyd  
McNary  
Macon  
Maynard  
Moon, Tenn.  
Nelson

Overstreet, Ga.  
Padgett  
Page  
Patterson, N. C.  
Patterson, S. C.  
Pou  
Rainey  
Randell, Tex.  
Richardson, Ala.  
Riordan  
Robinson, Ark.  
Rucker

Ruppert  
Russell  
Ryan  
Shackelford  
Sheppard  
Sherley  
Sims  
Slayden  
Small  
Smith, Ky.  
Smith, Md.  
Smith, Tex.

Stephens, Tex.  
Sullivan  
Sulzer  
Talbot  
Thomas, N. C.  
Trimble  
Wallace  
Watkins  
Webb  
Wiley, Ala.  
Williams  
Zenor

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.  
Goulden  
Hughes

NOT VOTING—127.

Acheson  
Ames  
Bankhead  
Bannon  
Bartholdt  
Beidler  
Bennett, Ky.  
Bingham  
Bishop  
Blackburn  
Boutell  
Bowers  
Bowersock  
Bowle  
Bradley  
Brooks, Tex.  
Broussard  
Brown  
Brownlow  
Buckman  
Burgess  
Burke, Pa.  
Butler, Pa.  
Butler, Tenn.  
Byrd  
Campbell, Ohio  
Clark, Fla.  
Cockran  
Coudry  
Dale  
Davey, Ia.  
Davis, Minn.

Davis, W. Va.  
Dickson, Ill.  
Dovener  
Dresser  
Dwight  
Field  
Floyd  
Foster, Ind.  
Fuller  
Garber  
Garner  
Gilbert  
Gillett  
Goebel  
Goldfogle  
Granger  
Griggs  
Gudger  
Hardwick  
Haugen  
Hearst  
Hedge  
Henry, Tex.  
Hermann  
Hogg  
Holliday  
Hopkins  
Howell, Utah  
Huff  
Jenkins  
Johnson  
Jones, Va.

Kitchin, Claude  
Kitchin, Wm. W.  
Klepper  
Lawrence  
Le Fevre  
Lilley, Conn.  
Lilley, Pa.  
Lindsay  
Livingston  
McCall  
McCarthy  
McCleary, Minn.  
McDermott  
McGavin  
McKinlay, Cal.  
McLachlan  
McLain  
Madden  
Meyer  
Michalek  
Minor  
Moon, Pa.  
Moore, Tex.  
Morrell  
Nevin  
Olmsted  
Overstreet, Ind.  
Palmer  
Pollard  
Pujo  
Ransdell, La.  
Reid

Rhinock  
Rhodes  
Richardson, Ky.  
Rives  
Roberts  
Robertson, La.  
Rodenberg  
Saunders  
Schneebeli  
Scroggy  
Siemp  
Smith, Cal.  
Southall  
Southwick  
Sparkman  
Spight  
Stafford  
Stanley  
Taylor, Ala.  
Thomas, Ohio  
Tirrell  
Towne  
Tyndall  
Underwood  
Van Duzer  
Van Winkle  
Webster  
Webber  
Weisse  
Welborn  
Young

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:  
Until further notice:

Mr. DRESSER with Mr. HENRY of Texas.  
Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. UNDERWOOD.  
Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.  
Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. SPARKMAN.  
Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. PUJO.  
Mr. WACHTER with Mr. MEYER.  
Mr. BROWN with Mr. BROUSSARD.  
Mr. BUCKMAN with Mr. BANKHEAD.

On this vote:

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JAMES. I want to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. This is not the amendment stage.

Mr. JAMES. I offer the following amendment, and ask that it be reported for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. The amendment is not in order. The previous question has been ordered. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision of the Chair that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that that appeal is dilatory.

Mr. JAMES. You know more than I do about it, then. I had made it in good faith.

Mr. SHERMAN. In good faith, after the previous question is ordered!

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the amendment I offer is an amendment to the Senate amendment.

Mr. DALZELL. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman has offered an amendment after the previous question has been ordered, and every Member of the House knows that the rules of the House prohibit it and that the appeal from the decision of the Chair can not be classed as anything else but dilatory.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment by the gentleman from Kentucky is not in order under the parliamentary status.

Mr. SULZER. That can not be determined until the amendment is read.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, let us have the amendment read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky proposes to offer an amendment after the previous question has been ordered on a motion to concur in the Senate amendments, and

the point of order is made that it is not in order to offer an amendment after the previous question is ordered. Under the present conditions the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JAMES. And from that decision, Mr. Speaker, I appeal.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order that the appeal is dilatory.

Mr. MANN. I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. JAMES. And upon that I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks for the yeas and nays.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. Thirty-six gentlemen have arisen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. JAMES. I demand the other side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands the other side. As many as are opposed to ordering the yeas and nays will rise. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-one gentlemen have arisen on the other side.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands tellers.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. Forty gentlemen have arisen; a sufficient number, and tellers are ordered.

The SPEAKER appointed the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] as tellers.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Kentucky did not demand tellers on ordering the yeas and nays.

Mr. FLOOD. The regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman from Kentucky intend to demand tellers on ordering the yeas and nays?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understood the gentleman.

The House divided; and the tellers reported 53 ayes and 143 noes.

The SPEAKER. On this question the ayes are 53 and the noes are 143, a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered. As many as are in favor of laying the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the table will answer "aye" and those opposed "no," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 67, answered "present" 10, not voting 141, as follows:

YEAS—159.

Allen, Me.  
Allen, N. J.  
Andrus  
Barchfeld  
Bates  
Bede  
Bennet, N. Y.  
Birdsall  
Bonyng  
Brick  
Brooks, Colo.  
Brumm  
Burke, S. Dak.  
Burleigh  
Burton, Del.  
Burton, Ohio  
Calder  
Calderhead  
Campbell, Kans.  
Capron  
Cassel  
Chaney  
Chapman  
Cocks  
Cole  
Conner  
Cooper, Pa.  
Cooper, Wis.  
Cousins  
Cromer  
Crumacker  
Cushman  
Dalzell  
Darragh  
Davidson  
Dawson  
Deemer  
Denby  
Dixon, Mont.

Draper  
Driscoll  
Dunwell  
Ellis  
Esch  
Fassett  
Fordney  
Foss  
Foster, Ind.  
Foster, Vt.  
Fowler  
French  
Fulkerson  
Galnes, W. Va.  
Gardner, Mass.  
Gardner, Mich.  
Gardner, N. J.  
Gilhams  
Graft  
Graham  
Granger  
Groona  
Grosvenor  
Hale  
Hamilton  
Haskins  
Hayes  
Henry, Conn.  
Hepburn  
Higgins  
Hill, Conn.  
Hinshaw  
Howell, N. J.  
Hubbard  
Hull  
Humphrey, Wash.  
Jones, Wash.  
Kahn  
Keifer  
Kellher

Kennedy, Nebr.  
Kennedy, Ohio  
Kinkaid  
Knapp  
Knopf  
Knowland  
Lacey  
Lafean  
Landis, Chas. B.  
Landis, Frederick  
Law  
Littauer  
Littlefield  
Longworth  
Lorimer  
Loud  
Loudenslager  
Loving  
Lowden  
McCreary, Pa.  
McMorran  
Mann  
Marshall  
Martin  
Mondell  
Moore, Pa.  
Mouser  
Mudd  
Murdock  
Needham  
Nelson  
Norris  
Olcott  
Otjen  
Parker  
Parsons  
Payne  
Pearre  
Perkins

Powers  
Prince  
Reeder  
Reyburn  
Reynolds  
Riordan  
Rodenberg  
Ruppert  
Samuel  
Saunders  
Scott  
Sbartel  
Sherman  
Sibley  
Smith, Ill.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Mich.  
Smith, Pa.  
Smyser  
Snapp  
Southard  
Sperry  
Steernerson  
Stevens, Minn.  
Sulloway  
Tawney  
Townsend  
Volstead  
Wadsworth  
Waldo  
Wanger  
Washburn  
Watson  
Weeks  
Weems  
Wiley, N. J.  
Wilson  
Wood  
Woodyard

NAYS—67.

Adamson  
Aiken  
Bartlett  
Beall, Tex.  
Bell, Ga.  
Brundidge  
Burleson  
Burnett  
Candler  
Clark, Mo.  
Clayton

De Armond  
Dixon, Ind.  
Finley  
Flood  
Galnes, Tenn.  
Garrett  
Gill  
Gillespie  
Gregg  
Hay  
Hefflin

Hill, Miss.  
Houston  
Howard  
Humphreys, Miss.  
Hunt  
James  
Lamar  
Lee  
Lever  
Lewis  
Lloyd

Macon  
Maynard  
Moon, Tenn.  
Overstreet, Ga.  
Padgett  
Patterson, N. C.  
Patterson, S. C.  
Pou  
Rainey  
Randell, Tex.  
Robinson, Ark.

Rucker  
Russell  
Ryan  
Shackelford  
Sheppard  
Sherley

Slayden  
Small  
Smith, Ky.  
Smith, Md.  
Smith, Tex.  
Stephens, Tex.

Sullivan  
Sulzer  
Talbot  
Thomas, N. C.  
Trimble  
Wallace

Watkins  
Webb  
Wiley, Ala.  
Williams  
Zenor

Glass  
Goldfogle  
Goulden

Hughes  
Kline  
Lamb

Legare  
Richardson, Ala.

Sims  
Southall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—10.

NOT VOTING—141.

Acheson  
Alexander  
Ames  
Babcock  
Bankhead  
Bannon  
Bartholdt  
Beidler  
Bennett, Ky.  
Bingham  
Bishop  
Blackburn  
Boutell  
Bowers  
Bowersock  
Bowie  
Bradley  
Brantley  
Broocks, Tex.  
Broussard  
Brown  
Brownlow  
Buckman  
Burgess  
Burke, Pa.  
Butler, Pa.  
Butler, Tenn.  
Byrd  
Campbell, Ohio  
Clark, Fla.  
Cockran  
Coudry  
Currier  
Dale  
Davey, La.  
Davis, Minn.

Davis, W. Va.  
Dickson, Ill.  
Dovener  
Dresser  
Dwight  
Edwards  
Ellerbe  
Englebright  
Field  
Fitzgerald  
Fletcher  
Floyd  
Fuller  
Garber  
Garner  
Gilbert  
Gillett  
Goebel  
Greene  
Griggs  
Gudger  
Hardwick  
Haugen  
Hearst  
Hedge  
Henry, Tex.  
Hermann  
Hogg  
Holliday  
Hopkins  
Howell, Utah  
Huff  
Jenkins  
Johnson  
Jones, Va.  
Kitchin, Claude

Kitchin, Wm. W.  
Klepper  
Lawrence  
Le Fevre  
Lilley, Conn.  
Lilley, Pa.  
Lindsay  
Livingston  
McCall  
McCarthy  
McCleary, Minn.  
McDermott  
McGavin  
McKinlay, Cal.  
McKinley, Ill.  
McKinney  
McLachlan  
McLain  
McNary  
Madden  
Mahon  
Meyer  
Michalek  
Minor  
Moon, Pa.  
Moore, Tex.  
Morrell  
Murphy  
Nevin  
Olmsted  
Overstreet, Ind.  
Page  
Palmer  
Pollard  
Pujo  
Ransdell, La.

Reid  
Rhinoek  
Rhodes  
Richardson, Ky.  
Rives  
Roberts  
Robertson, La.  
Schneebell  
Scroggy  
Slomp  
Smith, Cal.  
Southwick  
Sparkman  
Spight  
Stafford  
Stanley  
Sterling  
Taylor, Ala.  
Taylor, Ohio  
Thomas, Ohio  
Tirrell  
Towne  
Tyndall  
Underwood  
Van Duzer  
Van Winkle  
Vreeland  
Wachter  
Webber  
Weisse  
Welborn  
Wharton  
Young

So the motion to lay the appeal on the table was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. COUDREY with Mr. BRANTLEY.

Mr. TIRRELL with Mr. ELLERBE.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. PAGE.

Mr. LE FEVRE with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

For the vote:

Mr. DALE with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. LEGARE.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania with Mr. KLINE.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to concur.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, just a moment. I understand that we have twenty minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. Under Rule XXVIII, clause 3, there not having been any debate on this proposition, the previous question being ordered, there is twenty minutes' debate on a side, in the opinion of the Chair. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of Congress the House passed House bill 13566, and it is now returned with certain amendments. By the act of March 14, 1900, our note issues of various kinds were all rearranged, the object being to bring our silver certificates down to practically \$10 and under, although 10 per cent of the silver certificates could be issued for \$20 and upward. Our gold certificates were \$20 and upward. Our United States notes were to be issued in a \$10 denomination and upward. The result was that in the course of three years we find that we had only practically half enough of \$1, \$2, and \$5 bills.

The House passed a bill providing for two changes, namely, a \$5 gold certificate, which also included a \$10 certificate, and that the national banks could issue such a part of their notes in \$5 denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury might authorize. The object was to cut up the two hundred and ninety-five millions of \$5 silver certificates in ones and twos, so far as the trade of the country might require. We sent that bill to the Senate, and they have amended it in one or two respects. They have changed the \$5 gold certificate to a \$10 gold certificate, and they have provided that the Secretary of the Treasury may issue \$1, \$2, and \$5 United States notes instead of cutting up the \$5 silver certificates as we intended by supplying the \$5 gold certificates. They also amended the bill in another respect. They exclude the exception in the act of

June, 1864, which provided that customs receipts should not be placed in the banks.

That exception was made in order that we might secure gold coin in order to pay interest on the public debt. They also made another change, which provided that, with the authority or approval of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Secretary of the Treasury, we could retire by deposits of lawful money nine millions of bank notes per month instead of three millions. Another amendment was that the public money should be equitably distributed throughout the United States. Those are the only amendments which were made, and the motion was to concur in those amendments.

Now I will give the gentlemen on the other side their twenty minutes and will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that such important legislation has come up at such a late hour of the session. I do not believe the Members of this House fully understand the importance of this bill. The gentleman from New Jersey has stated the points in the bill sent over by the House to the Senate. That bill was a very innocent one. It merely provided for the cutting down of some of our larger denominations of money into smaller bills. The Senate has taken this bill and amended it and sent it back to us entirely disguised or in a new form. The original House bill provided for the cutting down of the \$20 gold certificates into \$5 certificates. The Senate amended the bill so as to cut them down to \$10 denominations instead of \$5, as provided in the House bill. The Senate then ingrafted very dangerous legislation, to my mind, on the House bill, in that it authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit all and every kind of money, including customs receipts, with national-bank depositories of the United States. In 1864, when the national-bank act went into effect, it provided that only the internal-revenue receipts could be deposited by the Secretary of the Treasury in these depositories, but this bill provides now that the customs receipts shall also be deposited in these national-bank depositories.

Now, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to depositing this money in those depositories if we derived benefit from it by charging interest therefor. We are told that the country demands that this money go to the banks that it may bring prosperity and ease the financial stress, etc. Now, that all sounds very well, and I am willing to help the country, but through this bill we first help the national banks and afterwards the national banks help the country. Now, in Georgia we have a law by which the State money is deposited in the different State bank depositories, for which the State charges 2 per cent interest. Now, we ought to get interest on this money deposited in these national-bank depositories. I have noticed in the last ten years, and I only go back ten years, there has been an average deposit of \$150,000,000 in these depositories by the Government. Let us figure the interest at 2 per cent per annum. In the last ten years at 2 per cent, and 2 per cent is a low rate, it would have amounted to \$30,000,000 that this Government has given as a profit to the national banks of this country. I am putting that on the basis that the national banks only made 2 per cent. The national banks make more than 2 per cent. Now, if a national bank has a deposit with the Secretary of the Treasury of 2 per cent bonds as security to secure these deposits, then it can only make 2 per cent; but we see where the Secretary of the Treasury is now depositing other securities. I notice the statement in the morning paper, coming from the Treasury Department, in which it was stated that there were \$57,000,000 of deposits secured by State, municipal, and railroad bonds. Thus the profit to the banks must be much greater. But we will go further. As I understand, the great money centers get the real benefit of these deposits, because they have the security more readily to furnish the Secretary of the Treasury. We know that savings banks, trust companies, and life insurance companies all have many securities, such as bonds, etc., suitable for securing these deposits. Therefore national banks need not own at all times bonds to secure deposits, for they can go and hire or borrow these securities from these institutions. When they do that, they do not have to put their own money in the bonds. Then they make a profit up to the amount of interest they charge for the money loaned out. In other words, I will put it this way: We will take one of these depositories, say, in the city of New York, one of the large banks of \$25,000,000 capital. They want to get some of this free Government money. What would they do? They would go out to one of these trust companies, insurance companies, savings banks, or probably their customers, and borrow, or, if not, they would hire or rent, these bonds, and they can get them for a very small per cent. Then they send them on and get this money and lend it out at the present existing rate of 6 per cent. Then what profit will such



deposits net the banks? Six per cent on \$150,000,000 is \$9,000,000 a year. Take the New York banks, and they have been loaning money on call for the last six months at the rate of 10 and 20 per cent. Suppose we put it at 10 per cent, and what would be their profit? It would be \$15,000,000 a year on this Government money put out by the Secretary of the Treasury. Now, that applies to past and present conditions. Put this Senate bill into law, and the Secretary of the Treasury would be able to loan a much larger amount to the banks, thereby giving these favored banks of depository a very largely increased profit.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. How would the Treasury Department pay all of the debts of the Government if they deposited all the money in the banks on which they were going to draw this large amount of interest? Can the Secretary of the Treasury deposit anything but the surplus under any law?

Mr. LEWIS. I am only speaking of the surplus now. The present amount of money in the depositories is \$150,000,000, and a few days ago it was \$155,000,000. I am speaking of what is in the banks now. The New York Stock Exchange is looking forward to the passage of this bill. Let me read to you what comes out in the papers every day. I will read the headnotes. Here is one:

New York Stock Exchange. Tone very weak. Depression largely due to the delay of the Aldrich bill.

Meaning the bill which is now under consideration.

That came out a few days ago. Let me read here something of a day or two ago. It is as follows:

More or less encouragement was felt in the financial community over the prospect of the passage to-morrow in Congress of the Aldrich bill.

A few days ago Wall street was troubled for fear this bill would not become a law, but on yesterday they were happy because they thought the bill would pass.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to have printed as a part of my remarks an editorial from the New York World, which I think strongly expresses the true results to come from the operation of this bill:

#### A GIFT TO THE BANKS.

Before the Aldrich currency bill is passed by the House of Representatives it should be amended, as ably urged by Mr. NELSON in the Senate, to provide for the payment of 2 per cent interest by national banks upon Government money deposited with them.

No Member of the House who votes for the measure without that amendment will ever be able to explain to his constituents why he does so, for there is no explanation. Senator SPOONER attempts one when he says:

"The object in depositing money in the banks is not to secure interest thereon, but to get the money in circulation among the people."

That is one object undoubtedly. But in accomplishing that object the Government need not and it should not make a free gift every year to James Stillman, George F. Baker, Valentine Snyder, and other bankers of the United States of a million dollars or so of interest money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say more, but we have only twenty minutes for debate, and there are other Members who desire to speak. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, this bill properly defined is a bill to turn four hundred millions of the people's money into the Wall-street banks in New York. That is what it means. You can not deny it. It can not be disguised. You can not conceal it. That is the true situation. But it means more than that. It means not only to turn \$400,000,000 into the Wall-street banks, but it means to deny to every other bank in the United States a fair opportunity to get this money deposited in those banks, that the people in the West, and in the South, and in the other parts of the United States may have the opportunity to use it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Not only that, but you give it to these banks without a dollar of interest, and when you voted to sustain the Speaker in ruling my amendment out of order, when I appealed from his decision, you voted to turn over to the national banks four hundred millions of the people's money without a dollar of interest.

The amendment which I proposed was as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury before depositing any public money in the national banking associations designated as depositories for same shall advertise for bids of interest under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and in depositing said money aforesaid in the national banking associations he shall deposit same with the national banking associations paying the greatest amount of interest for same, but in no event shall the rate of interest be less than 2 per cent. Where the rate of interest bid by more than one national banking association for any deposit of such public money is an equal rate above the 2 per cent aforesaid, the Secretary of the Treasury in such event shall distribute said public money equitably in the various national banking associations throughout the various States making such equal bids, and the rate of interest chargeable upon the public money deposited in the national banking associations under this act shall be computed from the average daily balance of such deposit: *Provided*, That the amount deposited in any national banking association, under the provisions of this act, shall not exceed 50 per cent of the capital stock of such association.

But the party in the majority upon this floor, knowing that this amendment would be presented, fearing even their own side

upon a vote directly upon it, seek to conceal their true purpose behind parliamentary tactics and deny to the country the opportunity to see their votes recorded upon the amendment itself. The majority knowing I had heretofore offered it in the committee, that I had declared upon this floor on February 16 of this year that I would introduce this amendment, they resort to the previous question to hide behind it, afraid to meet an outraged people upon the direct issue, by saying the amendment was not voted on, when by their votes sustaining the Speaker they made it impossible to vote on it. On February 16 in the House I used this language:

We are told that in the Senate a bill will soon be passed that will come through here with the rapidity of a streak of lightning, providing that the customs duties shall be deposited in the national banks and the national banks shall keep that money there, perhaps \$400,000,000 a year, without any interest and loan it to whom they please at from 6 to 10 per cent.

The amendment which provides for interest had been submitted to and approved by my Democratic colleagues upon the committee and to the floor leader of the minority upon this side, and had his approval as the true Democratic policy upon the question of the loaning of public money to the national banks. When I appealed from the decision of the Chair refusing me the opportunity to have this amendment considered in the House, a motion was made to lay the appeal upon the table, and in this way we have a direct vote upon the question of whether or not the national banks should use the people's money without interest or pay interest therefor. Every Member upon the floor knew when he cast his vote, if he voted to overrule the decision of the Speaker, that this amendment would be considered, and if adopted the millions of the people's money deposited in the banks would bring into the public Treasury as interest between five and ten millions of dollars yearly. The record of that vote is now history, but the country is afforded the opportunity of seeing the friends of themselves upon one side and those who believe in giving their money out to corporations without interest on the other side. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, under this amendment the public money would be loaned out under competitive bids of interest to the highest bidder. It provides where two or more associations make equal bids of interest that then the Secretary shall distribute said money equitably to the various banking associations throughout the States making such equal bids, and it limits the amount that may be deposited in any one bank to 50 per cent of the capital stock. Who is prepared to proclaim that this is not just? When this matter was under consideration in the Senate the Senate had an opportunity to vote directly upon the question of interest, and I believe that if the House had been given such an opportunity, they would have voted by a considerable majority in favor of making the banks pay interest.

Under the provisions of this bill which you are now considering, which, when it went from the House only provided for the issuance of gold certificates in denomination less than \$20, was amended in the Senate so as to strike out the words "customs dues," which is now the law, which requires all of the customs dues collected to be turned into the United States Treasury, and by this amendment turns this money into the banks in the respective ports of entry throughout the United States, and as we all know New York port collects 70 per cent of the money collected under our customs duty system, therefore 70 per cent of this money will be deposited in the New York banks. It is virtually the only system we have of getting gold, as customs dues are paid in gold. And this gold now is to be turned into the national banks without any interest at all.

Why was this scheme held back until the last hours of the Fifty-ninth Congress? And here it comes into this House at 12:30 o'clock Sunday morning to be considered, and all debate shut off, except a very limited time upon each side for the discussion of this momentous question.

The State of Missouri loans its money out to competitive bidders and by this gets 3 per cent. The State of Kentucky, which I have the honor in part to represent upon this floor, gets 2½ per cent interest upon its public money, and many other States of this Union get interest upon the public fund. If this amendment were adopted which I have offered, competitive bids would have been received by the Secretary of the Treasury from the far West, from the South, from the Northwest, and the national bankers of these sections of the country, the producing section, would have had a chance to make bids upon this money. But this opportunity is denied them and, under the provisions of this bill, three-fourths of this money will go into the Wall street banks, to be used by the gamblers upon the stock market, and the Treasury of the United States made an ally

and an aid to the bulls and bears in the market. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. I have not got time. Your side would not give us a chance for a fair debate, or I would have been glad to yield to any gentleman in this House. But you gentlemen knew well enough that this bill would not stand the open light of discussion, and hence you keep us down to twenty minutes' debate upon it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of this bill, which was amended in the Senate, and now up for consideration, it is provided:

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall require the associations thus designated to give *satisfactory* security by deposit of United States bonds and otherwise for the public money.

What does this mean? It means that the Secretary of the Treasury will have the right, under the provisions of this bill, to designate bonds of any character, whether railroad bonds, trust bonds, or bonds of whatever description, whether Southern Pacific Railroad bonds, Louisville and Nashville Railroad bonds, Illinois Central Railroad bonds, or any bonds whatever as may be satisfactory to him will be deposited as security for this money, which is to be loaned to the banks without interest; and it is further provided in this bill "that the Secretary shall on or before the 1st of January of each year make a public statement of the securities required during that year for such deposit."

Under the provisions of this bill the Secretary can affect the market value of the bonds and securities of every description. It puts the United States Government, in an official way, as a gambler upon the stock markets, because every man knows that when the secretary declares that bonds of a certain character will be received for the deposit of public money that it will have a tendency to make those bonds rise in value and therefore will aid the gamblers upon the market who are playing that side of the issue, and yet after millions of the public money have been deposited in the national banks, secured by such bonds as may be *satisfactory* to the Secretary of the Treasury, have been deposited in the national banks, we are not informed how the Government is to be reimbursed in case of a collapse of these stocks. It has never been held by any Secretary of the Treasury since this Government has been in existence that any bonds should be accepted for the deposit of public money except national bonds until Secretary Shaw made this ruling during his term of office. National bonds have always been accepted as security, because the Government looked upon its bond as being as good as gold; but now under the provisions of this bill it invites the Secretary, indeed, directs that he shall accept other bonds than national bonds, and that he shall advertise what bonds are to be acceptable. Satisfactory security to the Secretary? National bonds? No. Satisfactory security? What sort? Southern Pacific Railroad bonds.

Mr. CLAYTON. Satisfactory to whom?

Mr. JAMES. Oh, satisfactory to the bankers. Satisfactory to the money changers, not satisfactory to the people.

Mr. Speaker, only day before yesterday, by a majority of three votes, after the opposition had won upon the first vote, upon a reconsideration, which was made possible only by a majority of three, this House decided to give to the shipbuilding trust a subsidy of \$4,000,000 a year for ten years. But now, to-night, you are called upon to vote to give to the national bankers' trust a subsidy of from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 a year. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But the viciousness of this system does not end here, Mr. Speaker. Not only have you done this, but you have inaugurated this vicious system which will make it possible for the Secretary of the Treasury to get enormous campaign funds to corrupt the elections and to debauch the ballot. And how is this done? Under the provisions of my amendment bids should be advertised for the public money; the bank that bid the greatest per cent of interest could get it, but under the provisions of this bill this money is to be deposited in the national banks as the *Secretary of the Treasury may direct*. No competitive bid of interest, no interest at all, but merely to be deposited by him. After these millions of dollars have been deposited in the national banks by the Secretary of the Treasury, what will be done when election time is drawing near? The head of the Republican party will go to these national banks and to the stockholders of same and point out to them that they have had the use of millions of the *people's money without interest* through the favoritism of the *Republican Secretary of the Treasury* and will modestly suggest that the Republican party is in need of campaign money, and of course it will be forthcoming in abundance. Can the people indorse such a system as this? Is the public mind so adverse to all idea of equal chance and fair opportunity that

it desires to change the doctrine that the Government should deal equitably with all her citizens, regardless of political affiliations, and that public legislation should be for the public weal and not for political campaign corruption funds? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me quote to you here what Mr. Berry, the treasurer of the great State of Pennsylvania, had to say upon the question of interest, when testifying before the Committee on Banking and Currency at its hearings recently. He said:

Of course money is worth more than 2 per cent to any bank, and the demand for it makes a contention between the different bankers in the State as to who shall have it, and keeps the treasurer in constant hot water, and he has no index as to where it ought to go. If, however, we had a competitive interest rate, then the man who wanted it the most would pay the most for it and would pay it and turn the proceeds to the city, the State, or the nation, as the case might be.

So we see this brilliant financier of one of the greatest States of the Union declaring in favor of a competitive rate of interest. He states that the State of Pennsylvania gets 2 per cent interest upon its deposits; that the State of Maryland gets 2½ per cent interest on its deposits.

The purpose, Mr. Speaker, of the Democratic side in this controversy is to divorce the United States Government from Wall street. It is to give equal chance and equal opportunity to all the citizens of the United States. It is to give to the people interest upon its public funds. It is to give to the bankers of all parts of this Union an equal chance to bid for the public money and not be denied this right through the arbitrary action of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Let me quote to my Republican friends upon the other side of this Chamber the language of a distinguished Republican United States Senator, Mr. McCUMBER, who, in discussing this question when it was in the Senate, used this language:

I certainly fail to understand why the bankers receiving the benefit should not pay the 2 per cent, or whatever may be necessary. If the money is worth nothing to them, there is nothing to compel them to take the money. If they do not need it badly enough to pay the extra 2 per cent, let it go as it is. If they do not need the money, then we certainly should not give it to him. But I presume, Mr. President, that the money they have received from the Treasury of the United States has been of inestimable value to them not only in loaning it again, but in upholding an immense amount of industrial securities that are held by banks until they can get rid of them; and that, I believe, more than anything else, is the basis of the desire of these great banks of New York and other eastern cities to secure Government deposits without the payment of one cent of interest.

Who can dispute the logic and the justice of this argument? Who is willing to declare for a standard in this country of taxation so high that it will fill the Treasury to overflowing with the people's money, which is to be loaned to the banks without interest, that they may fatten upon it?

Let me quote the language of another distinguished United States Senator in discussing this bill, which is known as the "Aldrich bill." I quote from Senator NELSON:

If the banks were simply required to keep this money in their vaults and were not permitted to loan it out, or if they would loan the Government money to the people without interest, I would not say anything. But where they take this volume of Government money by the millions and loan it out and loan it out on stock collaterals at an immense profit, why, in the name of justice and fairness, should we not compel them to pay a portion of the gains to the Government of the United States?

Yet, Mr. Speaker, all these arguments have been brushed aside, and here beyond midnight on the Sabbath day this legislation is to be rushed through under the whip and spur of the previous question in less than one hour's consideration, turning over the Federal Treasury to the benign mercies of the coupon clippers and the money changers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The people of this country should inquire why it is that nearly every State in this Union is receiving interest upon its public money from the banks of from 2 to 3 per cent, and when these banks are paying interest to depositors of from 3 to 4 per cent, they want to know why the men who represent them upon this floor will turn over their money to the banks without any interest at all? [Applause on Democratic side.] You remember, Mr. Speaker, when the subtreasury scheme was up, you and those who thought with you denounced that as Populistic, and said that it had a tendency to anarchism; but, Mr. Speaker, it should be recalled that those struggling farmers only wanted under that system the opportunity to pledge their crops for public money, upon which they were always willing to pay interest. But now, after having denounced that system, your party turns and takes the money for which they were willing to pay interest and turns it over to the national banks without a single cent of interest, and back of this money to secure it you have no fruition of the harvest field, no gathered crop, no bursting bin, but only the inflated, watered stock as may by the Secretary of the Treasury be declared to be ac-



ceptable. In the name of the American people, Mr. Speaker, I protest against this outrage upon them. Your party, flushed with many victories, seem to have the opinion that you shall never be called to account. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I would remind you gentlemen upon the other side that a public office is a public trust; that the public money in the Treasury is a public trust, and, in my judgment, if the people of this great Republic come to understand this question, they will drive from power a party which is drunk with rapacity and public plunder. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LEWIS. I ask the gentleman from New Jersey to consume some of his time.

Mr. FOWLER. You had better use all your time.

Mr. LEWIS. I prefer not to use it all at this time.

Mr. FOWLER. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the eloquent assertions the gentleman from Kentucky has just made on this floor, this bill is wise legislation and is demanded and indorsed by the best business interests of the country, and the persistent opposition to it by our Democratic friends will not commend itself to the country or gain for them any special credit, glory, or political advantage. The newspapers of to-day state that the prospect that this bill will pass has created confidence and strengthened the market, and so far as I have seen them, all indorse it. Assertions are not facts. The gentleman says this is to dump \$400,000,000 of the people's money into Wall street for the benefit of the gamblers there, and take it away from other sections and places whenever the Secretary of the Treasury sees fit to do so. Now, let us see what the bill provides and how much of truth there is in this statement. I assert that the bill expressly prohibits such action.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. POWERS. I have not time to yield.

On page 6, commencing in line 23, it reads as follows:

*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall distribute the deposits herein provided for, as far as practicable, equitably between the different States and sections.

Perhaps the gentleman from Kentucky will see in the record of his remarks that this is a sufficient answer to that contention.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman state if in the Fifty-eighth Congress he did not vote that the national banks should pay interest to the Government on deposits of the public funds?

Mr. POWERS. I shall answer that in this way: That this is a bill that is dealing with the present; it has several provisions that are necessary; we must pass this as it is or get no legislation whatever. This is the one and only chance that we have to get any legislation this session along the lines the bill proposes, and the matter of interest can wait and be attended to by the next Congress.

Mr. JAMES. Well, answer the question then.

Mr. POWERS. I must absolutely decline to be interrupted. Now, it may be that it is not entirely satisfactory to me and that it could be improved if we had time to do it, but we must take this bill as it is or take none. We are not getting interest on deposits now; the bill makes no change in that regard. I think it may be proper to charge interest, since it settles the question that other securities and Government bonds may be used by the banks, but, as I have said, that question must be relegated to a future Congress. It was exhaustively discussed in the Senate and defeated by a large majority. Therefore I submit for the present to what is inevitable.

The gentleman from Kentucky says, "Why should not the United States receive interest on its money?" that the State of Kentucky and the State of Missouri? The State of Kentucky, the State of Missouri, and the State of Maine deposit their money with the banks without demanding any such security from the banks receiving it as the United States would require. As far as I know none whatever is demanded. That is a very cogent reason why they should receive interest on their deposits. This bill endeavors to return to the channels of trade the money of the people instead of locking it up in the Treasury, a condition tending to create panics and which does not exist in any other civilized country, which is of vastly more importance to the country than the mere question of interest on any deposit.

It also provides for the printing and distribution of one and two dollar bills, which the business interests of the country urgently demand. It also authorizes, with the consent and approbation of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency, an increase in the retirement of national-bank bills to the amount of \$9,000,000 each month instead of the \$3,000,000 limitation under existing law.

We have had before the Committee on Banking and Currency several of the leading bankers of this country, and according to the statements of all of them the one thing that is more troublesome than any other is the nonelasticity of our present currency system. It has seemed to me, though I believe my views are not fully shared or indorsed, that by permitting banks to retire a much larger sum every month we hold out the inducement to them, when money is needed, to take out or issue a larger amount of national-bank notes; and the bankers advocating credit or asset currency demand it especially for the reason that it will give greater elasticity and contract automatically when the abnormal demand has ceased.

For the purpose of effecting that a bill has been introduced substantially along the lines recommended by the bankers' committee, known as the "Fowler bill," being H. R. 23017, but I do not concede that this bill will effect any such purpose for reasons which I shall endeavor to explain, and at the same time submit my views upon the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TALBOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. POWERS. I understand that my time has expired, and I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for one minute.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] has control of the time that is left on that side.

Mr. TALBOTT. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me one minute?

Mr. LEWIS. The time is already promised on this side, but I yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. TALBOTT. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS] has stated that one of the reasons why the Government made these deposits in the national banks without interest was because the banks in the various States which do pay interest on State deposits are not required to give security. I desire to state to the gentleman that the moneys belonging to the State of Maryland are deposited in the various national banks through the State, and the State receives 2½ per cent interest, and every bank is required to give bond.

Mr. POWERS. That may be so in Maryland, but I do not believe that is the rule as to any other State in the Union, and the requiring of a bank to give bond is a very different thing from requiring the deposit of bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I apprehend, if one sought to be considered wise in reference to financial and banking matters and to escape all criticism, it might be much better and easier to subscribe to the views of the bankers' committee in reference to the issuing of credit currency, and I concede that their large experience gives them a weight that should command consideration. Nevertheless, I shall have the temerity to doubt and differ from some of their conclusions.

I listened very attentively to the eminent bankers who appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have also carefully read the plan or method proposed by the fifteen representatives, from all sections of our country, of the great financial institutions in different monetary centers. I must confess that I am not convinced of its desirability or wisdom or that it will accomplish what is so confidently claimed for it, especially by giving to the country a credit currency which shall be sufficiently elastic to retire from circulation as soon as the emergency or conditions that called it into existence have passed.

By general consent of all who have studied the question and have carefully looked into and considered it, it is conceded that one of the most glaring defects in our present banking laws is the want of currency elasticity, so that the amount in circulation may accommodate itself to the business demands of the country at different times, as is the case in Canada, and, I believe, in some other countries.

This condition, I am confident, could be relieved to some extent by either repealing the \$3,000,000 limitation which banks may now retire in one month or increasing it so as to permit them to retire at least twelve or fifteen million dollars per month. I doubt very much if this limitation was ever necessary or has been productive of any good. The last thing that banks desire is a panic and the consequent loss flowing therefrom. Hence I do not believe that they would do anything which should create an alarming stringency through the sudden retiring of their currency if they had the power to do it. But

admitting that there was a sufficient reason for the enactment, I submit that the reason no longer exists, and that we should either repeal or modify it.

We have been adding year by year to the volume of our various kinds of currency as the national wealth and business have increased. We have increased the circulation of national-bank notes so much during the past forty years that the right of the banks to retire a very much larger sum would only be extending the proportion which was granted them when the banking laws were passed, and this change should commend itself to the Congress and be enacted into law. I have hoped that a bill might be presented for that purpose solely and not connected with anything else, so that it would be debated and considered on its merits and voted upon.

It is my deliberate judgment that a credit currency as proposed by the bankers' committee, with a 2½ per cent tax on circulation to create a safety fund, or with a 3 per cent tax as in the bill now before the House, said currency to be issued as therein provided and to be possessed of so many of the attributes of money, will be readily received by all the people of the country with the same confidence as national-bank notes or any of the other denominations of currency now in circulation. And I have no question that it will be as safe and as good as our other varieties of money which we have in circulation, and I am sure that no one can or will lose anything by receiving it as money; that it will circulate among and lodge in the pockets of the people and in all the moneyed institutions, and that it will substantially accomplish all the requirements and purposes of money.

It is not upon any doubt as to its validity or its soundness that I place my objection to it, but I do contend that these very qualifications will prevent any immediate return to the banks issuing it through the several redemption agencies which it is proposed to provide for that purpose. In short, I fear and believe that the result of this credit-currency legislation will be the addition of another variety of money to our already multiplex currency, and also that it will largely inflate the circulation of the country, thereby further reducing and cheapening its purchasing power, intensifying the era of extravagance and speculation through which we are now passing.

Now, I for one am unalterably opposed to any inflation legislation. There are still ample means by which our currency can be properly increased under existing laws. To my mind, an inflation of \$200,000,000 of our currency is uncalled for, and will sooner or later prove injurious to every legitimate industry. It may benefit for the present the speculator and promoter. Certainly none other. If I do not misrecall, the Secretary of the Treasury says in his report that such an expansion would indicate or produce no peril to the stability of the currency, but it does seem to me that we are making our various paper credits pretty large, considering the amount of gold that we have at the base; yet I do not apprehend that we will have any serious trouble so long as the balance of trade is in our favor and the outflow of gold does not exceed the amount that we can produce from our mines, and confidence continues unimpaired. Therefore I am inclined to concur in the views of the Secretary, and am not fearful of any resulting panic.

By the coinage of gold and silver, the organization of additional national banks, and the issuing of national-bank notes we added to the circulating medium of the country in the past fiscal year over \$148,000,000. The mines are still producing an increased amount of gold, banks are being organized everywhere, and I have no doubt that in this manner we shall increase it fully as much during the present year.

Many banks now organized—in fact, most of them—can issue more currency if they choose to do so. We have in this country to-day almost \$34 per capita, more than ever before, I am confident, and more than any other country in the world, except France. There are still bonds available for banking purposes and there is no immediate danger of the supply being exhausted. Many banks have bonds which they use as security for deposits placed with them from time to time by the Secretary of the Treasury. As they use them in this manner and for this purpose rather than for increasing their issues of national-bank notes, it is fair to assume that it is more profitable to do so. The opportunity for this use of Government bonds, and perhaps I should say the necessity results from the vicious and inadequate laws which lock the people's money in the Treasury instead of permitting it to be immediately returned to the channels of commerce and trade—a peculiar condition that Congress should relieve and do away with. I doubt if anything similar to it exists in any other civilized country.

The Government has been, and doubtless will from time to time, be placing upon the market Panama Canal bonds. These are all available for banking purposes, and I think it may be

assumed that a very large amount of them will be issued before we shall complete what I regard as the most difficult undertaking of modern times. I therefore submit that we have not reached the limit to which our currency can expand under the present banking laws, and that there is no such urgent and imperative demand for this credit currency legislation as some of its sponsors and advocates would have us believe. The amount authorized in the bill is not so large, if we should stop there, and it had an element of elasticity as to be seriously objected to, if it were advisable to issue it at all.

The restrictions, conditions, and limitations provided furnish, I think, ample safeguards to protect the holder, but I do respectfully dissent from the proposition that in enacting this legislation we are following a precedent of any of the countries to which its advocates refer, which furnishes to us, as they claim, a safe and reliable guide to go by, and I have a fear—I had almost said a conviction—that we are embarking on an unknown and, to a great extent, unexplored financial sea, with no reliable chart to guide us, and that inflation and not elasticity will be the inevitable and unavoidable result which must come from this undertaking. That there is great danger that when we have once opened the door and authorized this limited issue of credit currency we may soon be induced or compelled to enlarge the amount, as the same financial distress or scarcity of money that called for this issue may recur with each succeeding year; hence this experiment, in the end, by its inflation will be found very potent to nurse and aid speculation than to supply yearly a natural want to move the crops. And I submit that a careful analysis of all the evidence given by its advocates furnishes no good ground for relief, no satisfactory and convincing one to my mind, at least, showing that when the emergency was passed this currency would readily return, through the redemption channels or otherwise, to the issuing banks.

There can be no question that it would largely remain among the people and in the various banking institutions of the country. This was the view of the Secretary of the Treasury, as I recall it, in his statement before the committee. My recollection is that he thought 15 per cent might come back. There is no sufficient compelling cause to send it home. A distrust of its soundness or value in the minds of its holders would assuredly hasten it back, but, as I have tried to show, there can be nothing of this kind, as it is abundantly safeguarded.

Also, a tax so high as to make it unprofitable to issuing banks, except upon extraordinary occasions, might, and I concede would, be very effective.

If we look over the money market and the rates of interest for the past twelve months, there has been no time that the 3 per cent tax on circulation which the bill provides for would have made it unprofitable to the issuing banks. Perhaps the additional amount authorized to be issued under certain circumstances and contingencies at a 5 per cent tax might and probably would be called in. We all know that there were very low rates of interest in this country for a number of years, but that within the past one or two years, owing to our great undertakings and the rise in prices and in wages, there has been an increase in the rates of interest not only in this country, but in Europe. The Bank of England several months ago raised its rate to 6 per cent. Our unprecedented prosperity, in which most of the civilized world has shared to a considerable extent, has created an abnormal demand for money and has enabled the borrowers to pay higher rates of interest. This has resulted as a necessary consequence of our rapid and extensive industrial development and the financiering of new undertakings.

Perhaps we are suffering a little, as some claim, from too much prosperity, especially as regards the high rate of interest. Yet I contend that on the whole legitimate business of the country has not been crippled and I can see no dire calamity threatening it to-day. The chariot wheels of industry, progress, and legitimate enterprise have moved on continuously and rapidly. There has been no very marked change, so far as I know, in the rates of interest during the different months of the past year paid on good time business paper. Perhaps it may have been 1 to 2 per cent higher at some one time than at others. The farmer, the lumberman, and the manufacturer have not been very much cramped or injured for want of the necessary funds to do business with.

The great fluctuations in the price of call money have not seriously affected their loans or their business. It is the promoter and speculator, the gambler in stocks, that at times have paid very high call-money rates during the past year. They have to have it on the hour. I have been informed, and I think correctly, that there is a rule of the New York Stock Exchange which makes it imperative that all cash sales or purchases of stock must be settled every afternoon of the transaction ex-



cept upon Saturday. This obligation and peremptory requirement to settle and pay on so short a time often create great fluctuations in the rate of interest on call money from day to day, but I am not sure we need to give ourselves uneasiness or lay awake nights brooding over the hardships of these gentlemen who are striving to get rich quick by gambling in stocks. They are amply able to care for themselves; and if some one of them does occasionally get "pinched," it may be a debatable question if any honest man is hurt. It is the "lambs" they are shearing without compunction or mercy that need our protection and sympathy.

I can not agree with the oft-repeated statement that has been made before the committee, that the methods adopted for issuing currency in England, France, Germany, or Canada, so far as I have been able to learn anything about them, furnish any precedent or substantial guide for what we are proposing to do in this bill. Our systems of banking are *sui generis*. Wholly unlike those of the countries before named. There are, in round numbers, some 6,000 national banks, and I believe nearly 8,000 more chartered by the several States. They are located not only in large centers, but in nearly every small town and village. They are not interdependent; they are doing business on individual responsibility.

In Germany, France, and England there is one great central or imperial bank for each country, having various branches in different localities and all controlled and guided under one management, or this is substantially so. I have neither the time nor the requisite knowledge to explain the conditions and limitations under which currency is issued in those countries. I have never sufficiently investigated their banking systems to do this. I know, however, that they are very unlike our own in many essential particulars.

Canada is referred to in the committee's report and was also pointed out at the hearings as a guide and example for what this bill proposes to do. I deny that in its essentials there is any similarity between the proposed credit-currency scheme and the methods of issuing bank bills in Canada. The currency provided for in this bill can be issued by 6,000 banks scattered all over the Republic. There are only thirty-four banks in Canada. I do not know how many of that number can or do issue currency. I am informed, and I think correctly, that no bank in Canada has this right unless it has a paid-up capital of at least \$500,000. It can do no business until at least \$250,000 of its capital has been paid in. In Canada banks pay out over their counters their own bills only. The credit currency which this bill authorizes can be paid out to customers or kept in the vaults by every national, savings, and State bank in the United States. They need not send it to the issuing or the redemption bank unless they choose to do so. When a bank in Canada receives the bills of any other bank it must send them to the bank which issued them. It is very plain that this limitation would make the currency contract automatically when there is no special demand for it, after it has been returned to the bank of issue.

A similar clause in this bill would necessarily contract it very rapidly; yet I doubt very much if any of our national banks would avail themselves of the right or privilege of having this limitation upon its circulation, and the same, I think, might be true in case the tax was made much larger than this present bill provides. Banks are not philanthropic institutions. They are in business to make something for their stockholders.

It is claimed that the provision in this bill authorizing this currency is especially in the interests of the "dear" people. To my mind it is a pretty good thing for the banks. Hence it allows banks to surrender part of their present issues and reap the benefit of it under certain conditions. I grant that many bankers have declared that its passage is both necessary and wise. Yet I have not received any letters or petitions from anyone engaged in the various industries asking me to vote for it. I have found many who believe that the bill should not pass. The press of the country is not calling for it very loudly, so far as I am able to judge.

A question has presented itself to my mind as to the fund that will be raised from this 3 per cent tax, which I am not clear or sure that I am right about, and perhaps some one can explain it to me. There can be no doubt that the 3 per cent tax will in the not far distant future produce a much larger amount than will be required for the necessary expenses and the very small sum that may be lost or paid out and not ultimately recovered back on account of failing banks.

A careful examination of the cost and losses by national banks in the past will convince anyone of this proposition. Now, what I desire to know is this: Will not that fund belong to the banks collectively in the proportion of the amount each has

paid into it, and will or will not any bank winding up its affairs be entitled to have its equitable proportion refunded after all costs and liabilities up to that date have been adjusted and settled? If this is so, what bearing, if any, does it have upon the burdens which a higher tax than 3 per cent, or any tax, will in the last analysis place upon the issuing bank? The Treasury of the United States holds this money in trust. It can apply a certain amount of it, whatever may be necessary, to expenses and losses of failing banks. When that trust has been accomplished there is no provision whatever to turn the balance into the Treasury.

I have said that our national banking system is peculiar. I think that in its inception and in its methods of doing business it is unlike that of any other country. Our national bank notes are not secured by coin reserves, but by the debt of the United States. They rest upon the debt of the Government. At the time of its passage the framers of the national banking act had in view two distinct purposes at least. One was to provide the country with a safe, sound, and reliable currency which should be good and circulate freely everywhere; the other to create a demand for the then large Government indebtedness, or at least for a part of it, with which the country found itself burdened and struggling at the close of the war of 1861.

As to the latter purpose, time has proved that its authors "budded better than they knew." It has been a very potent factor in enabling the Government to refund all its obligations at constantly decreasing rates of interest and has created such a demand for Government bonds for banking purposes that its 2 percents command a premium. No other nation borrows money at so low a rate as ours, and certainly we could not if it were not for the use of the bonds for banking and the necessity of having them in order to do the banking business.

It has also provided us, as was intended, a safe and sound currency, circulating everywhere in our country, and in many foreign lands, without discount or distrust. No laborer ever lost a dime by taking it for his wage—in fact, no one cares whether a bank issuing a bill is located in Maine or Texas, whether it is solvent or has gone into the hands of a receiver. The United States stands behind it and is virtually pledged to redeem it, and it certainly has and will continue to do it.

It is common knowledge that our national banking system in the past has been most bitterly attacked and denounced by political organizations, yet it has stood the test of over forty years and to-day, I submit, the people are satisfied with it and believe in it.

Next to its transportation facilities, the currency and banking of a country are essential elements for its prosperity and development. A want of sufficient elasticity, so that it may expand and contract with the demands of business, seems to be the gravest charge now brought against our banking system, and I concede that there is much force and truth in this charge. This should, and I think can be, remedied in part at least by proper legislation. Doubtless it may have other faults and weak points, but we should not lose sight of the fact that it has in the past accomplished much of good and has fully justified its right to be and the wisdom of those creating it.

Possibly in time it may outlive its usefulness, and it may become necessary to substitute some other method of banking in its place, yet I doubt very much if we shall improve or strengthen it by any such experimental patchwork as the credit currency proposition in this bill. I am of those who believe that it is better, at least for the present, "to bear the ills we now have rather than fly to others that we know not of," and I am quite confident that the country and the people share largely in this view.

As I have stated, I fear that the measure will be productive of more harm than good. I doubt its wisdom and am not fully convinced of its imperative necessity or that it would produce the beneficial results its sponsors claim for it. We have many kinds of currency—gold, silver, copper, greenbacks, national bank notes, silver certificates, and gold certificates. I object to increasing the list by adding the proposed credit currency notes until the country has more carefully considered and weighed the proposition and fully understood its possible consequences. Does it lead us along the road of sound or populist finance? I am not entirely clear upon this point.

What I contend Congress can and should do, and do it speedily, is to repeal or increase the \$3,000,000 limitation to which I have referred, and should also provide some safe and secure methods by which money collected from the people by the Government, except so much as is needed for its present purposes, shall be immediately available, to be used in the trade and commerce of the country. Let us have less artificial in-

interference with monetary conditions, cease locking up in the Treasury of the United States the people's money, thereby creating a stringency and compelling the Secretary of the Treasury to do something unusual to avoid disaster or panic. After we have done this, which we can readily do, let Wall Street refrain from financing more than one new deal each day, especially of the Harriman dimensions, and I prophesy we will get on very well without this asset or credit currency, that business interests will be cared for, and, to use the words of Mr. Mattilini, we shall not go to the "demnition bow-wows," but, on the contrary, under the present good, efficient, and Republican Administration and the beneficial schedules of the much-maligned Dingley tariff, enterprise, peace, and happiness will still continue to rule and bless our land.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker, this is the best measure we can hope to have before us in the closing days of this Congress. It may not be all that we would like to have such a measure contain, but nevertheless this is the best bill that is presented to us with any hope of passing at this time. I wish we could make the banks pay interest on the deposits. The purpose of this bill is to issue gold certificates in denominations of not less than \$10. It also permits the depositing of customs receipts in the banks known as "depositories." It is said by some of the gentlemen on the floor that this will permit the placing in banks of \$400,000,000 that are not now placed in the banks of our country. The truth about it is that this has been done by indirection, and we are now seeking to do it directly. It is not enlarging the volume of money in this country, but it is permitting customs receipts to be placed in the banks and to check upon those deposits if they see fit. It is done now. All the statements to the effect that it is swelling the coffers of Wall street is not in accordance with the facts.

As to another provision, about raising the limit of retirement from \$3,000,000 to \$9,000,000 a month, if it was not for the limiting clause in this bill, saying that it should be done only with the consent of the Comptroller of the Currency and the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, I should not favor the provision, and I will state the reason why. On page 190 of the hearing before the Committee on Banking and Currency, the present great Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Shaw, stated as follows:

Mr. WEEMS. Mr. Secretary, I would like to ask you if it would not be necessary in that case to repeal the prohibition against retiring?

Secretary SHAW. No; that prohibition is quite generally misunderstood. That limitation is not against the redemption of notes, but against their retirement by a deposit of money. For instance, I can send in as many of the First National Bank notes as I please, every dollar of its issue, for that matter.

Mr. WEEMS. That is the retirement as distinguished from a redemption?

Secretary SHAW. Yes; and I want to speak on that subject a moment. That provision, I think, should be amended so as to allow, with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, an unlimited retirement. I do not think the bridge should be taken off entirely, and I will tell you why. When I was selling the Panama bonds this year and was trying to stimulate the price, some banks started in to reduce the price so that the Government bonds would sell lower; and they started to retire their circulation and put their bonds on the market to pound the price down, while I was making deposits to crowd the price up, and we had a very nice chase.

They had a limit of three millions a month, and I had no limit, and I got away with them, and I ran the price up over 1 per cent. [Laughter.] But they would have whipped me and bought those bonds probably below one-dollar-two instead of one-dollar-four, without that limitation.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I desire unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maine was singularly unfortunate in his statement of facts. The gentleman from Maryland stated to the House the case in his State, and I am informed that is the case in Georgia. Each State requires security as well as interest. I hold in my hands the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I find that it is the case in Pennsylvania, too.

I find that Pennsylvania requires security; that she lends the money at 2 per cent, and Mr. Berry, who was before the committee—the treasurer, I believe, of that State—says that such is the demand on the part of the banks for money after giving security and upon condition of paying 2 per cent that, to use his language, "It keeps the treasurer in constant hot water, and he has no index as to where it ought to go—none whatever under that system." He continues:

If, however, we had a competitive interest rate, then the man who wanted it the most would pay the most for it, and the man who took it would return the proceeds to the city or the State or the nation, as the case might be.

I could go entirely through the Union and find that the gentleman from Maine simply didn't know what he was talking about. Now, Mr. Speaker, banks do not lend money without demanding of the borrower both security and interest. The banks ought not to expect to borrow money from the people—and it is the people, because the Government's money is the people's money—without paying interest and without giving security. This whole thing, Mr. Speaker, the evil upon which you have arrived and the bad remedy that you are resorting to to cure it, are alike the results of your pernicious system of class legislation.

The best way to keep money in circulation among the people is not to tax it out of circulation into the Treasury. [Applause.] But when you have taxed it out of circulation into the Treasury, then, of course, it is a bad thing to keep it in the Treasury if you can get it back into circulation. Now, then, you are forced to put out this surplus somewhere; you call it a deposit, but you are forced to put the money out at work. Everything in this world that produces value is at work, and money is no exception to the general rule. And as money works and is an employee—and is a valuable employee at that—the universal custom of humanity is that you should pay something for it as its wage, besides securing the return of the money itself. There is no more reason why the Federal Government should lend its money to a pet class of bankers without demanding a dollar of compensation for the use of it and without security for its return than there is why the bank should lend me its money without demanding interest and security from me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a significant occasion. We all remember when the Hill bill was before this House; we remember when the majority of this House incorporated upon that bill a provision whereby it became necessary to put out the deposits to competitive interest bids to the banks. We remember very well that after that provision got upon that bill that bill died "aborning." They never dared carry the bill any further, they never dared face the country with the question of interest on deposits. And now you wait until just two nights before the close of this Congress and you bring into this House an entire currency bill grafted by the Senate upon a little innocent House bill—to do what? To take the people's money and give it to the banks without a dollar of interest. [Applause.] Hide behind what pretexts you please, that is what you are doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the effect of this bill is only to give to the country a larger supply of one, two, and five dollar notes. There will be no other practical result whatever, and if the committee will bear with me, I would like to give my views of the present situation.

Let the merchants and bankers of the country answer these questions:

First. If our revenues be great enough to pay off our debt in the course of a few years, what shall we do for currency? What will become of the \$600,000,000 of bank notes secured by Government bonds? Let them remember that our debt was reduced, from 1888 to 1891, \$440,663,020.

Second. If, by any chance, we should be compelled to issue one or two thousand millions of bonds under stress of war, what would be the rate of interest? Not less than 3 per cent—probably under present demands for capital not less than 4 per cent. With an issue of, say, \$2,000,000,000 at 4 per cent, what would be the selling price of the 2 per cent bonds? Would it exceed seventy? At this price the banks of the country would lose in their present bond investments about \$200,000,000.

These possibilities alone ought to be sufficient to startle every thinking man and to condemn the present scheme of supplying currency for the country—a scheme in no way related to business demands, but distinctly a bond speculation.

But it is constantly asserted that we have the soundest currency in the world; and that it has been as good as the best for more than forty years. As a matter of fact, it has been no better than the price of our national credit. In 1862, when the banks in New Orleans were still redeeming their notes in gold coin, our bank currency was being redeemed in United States notes worth 75 cents on the dollar. And in 1864 our bank currency was being redeemed in United States notes, which were selling at \$2.85, or 35 cents in gold. And they were never worth their face until we resumed specie payments January 1, 1879.

The credit of a nation, of a municipality, or of a corporation should never be the basis of currency; its only proper relation is that to the consumable wealth of a country, and its standard of value should be gold, or the metal of redemption.

The history of the bank of France and its signal aid to the



French Government in every crisis for one hundred years justifies the conclusion that the currency of a country should always rest upon its liquid wealth, as represented by the credits of commerce.

The average daily clearings last year for New York City were \$342,422,000. The total clearings for New York City in 1906 were \$103,754,000,000, and were settled by the payment in cash of 3.69 per cent, or \$3,832,000,000.

The aggregate clearings of the United States for the year ending September 30, 1906, were \$157,749,000,000 and were settled by paying approximately \$5,793,000,000 in cash. Yet in the form of current credits, instead of paying only 3.69 per cent in gold or its equivalent, the percentage of lawful or reserve money in the hands of the people, with which they transact their daily business, is \$1,206,531,814—the remaining money in their hands, consisting of bank notes, approximated \$500,000,000. In other words about 60 per cent of current transactions are paid in reserve money, gold or its equivalent, instead of some form of credit; and \$1,206,531,814 of gold or its equivalent is lodged in the pockets and tills of the people, and there locked up as effectually as though it were still in the bowels of the mountains.

If this vast reserve were in the banks, where it should be, it would serve as the basis of a credit of \$6,000,000,000, with a reserve of 20 per cent. If we are going on, increasing in population and withdrawing reserves from the channels of trade for the daily transaction of current business, what effect will the practice have upon our present reserves or those we might hope to accumulate from the current production of gold?

Let no man suppose that the change of the law in respect to the \$3,000,000 limit per month will have the slightest effect upon present currency conditions. It will not result in any perceptible change in our currency as related to business, but will of course facilitate the speculation in Government bonds to some extent. I challenge any man to give a single reason for supposing that the privilege of retiring \$9,000,000 per month will result in any greater changes than we have heretofore had so far as our business requirements are concerned.

#### NATIONAL BANK-NOTE CIRCULATION, 1890-1906.

Total national-bank notes outstanding at the end of August and December, in the years named and at the end of the following April.

Year.	August.	December.	April.
1890.....	\$184,391,633	\$178,568,376	\$171,805,064
1891.....	168,543,059	172,993,607	172,529,451
1892.....	172,527,713	173,614,871	176,094,544
1893.....	183,755,148	208,948,105	207,875,695
1894.....	207,539,066	206,686,337	207,541,211
1895.....	211,372,046	213,960,598	221,316,027
1896.....	226,030,042	235,398,890	233,795,141
1897.....	230,844,256	229,634,216	224,481,878
1898.....	226,780,064	242,784,805	243,134,892
1899.....	241,623,553	243,842,067	271,034,337
1900.....	320,095,890	332,292,300	350,101,405
1901.....	356,152,908	359,720,711	357,476,407
1902.....	358,884,183	384,854,514	382,519,258
1903.....	417,846,487	421,106,979	434,909,942
1904.....	450,206,888	460,679,075	475,948,944
1905.....	503,971,395	540,914,347	556,646,282
1906.....	569,852,303		

Mark this, that from 1890 to 1906, a period of sixteen years, there was an actual decrease of our bank-note currency from August to December in three of those years when it should have largely increased, while in seven of those years the increase was only about \$3,000,000 each year. As a matter of fact, during these months the expansion of current credits ought to have been more than \$250,000,000 in every year.

During nine of those sixteen years there was an actual increase of currency from December to April, when it should have decreased; and for seven years there was a decrease during the same months of only \$2,700,000 per year.

Mark this, from 1864, when the first national-bank notes were issued, there was a gradual increase up to 1882, when the amount reached \$357,000,000. Then, out of the plenitude of ignorance and mad prejudice, this uneconomic limitation of \$3,000,000 each month was imposed.

From that very year, although the business of the country was constantly expanding, the national-bank notes began to contract, and, from 1882 to 1891, the \$352,000,000 fell to \$123,000,000.

Keeping these facts in mind, are we not at least put upon inquiry when we recall that in little Canada, to the north of us, with a population of only 5,800,000, they have an expansion and contraction of about \$20,000,000 in the fall, or more than \$3 per capita; while in Germany the expansion and contraction of bank notes or current credits is about \$120,000,000 every three months.

If the principle of a true credit currency, such as is in operation in Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, Austria, Japan, and Canada, were in force here, the expansion and contraction of current credits would annually exceed \$250,000,000; and we would have no currency famines nor useless quantities of currency, at times suggesting if not leading to riotous and ruinous speculations, and constantly disturbing the natural and orderly course of business.

Again, let us not suppose that, so far as the business interests of the country are concerned, it is a matter of any consequence whatever that we have removed the words "except receipts from customs" from the statutes, except in this respect—that the Government can save the cost of transporting customs receipts from the point where received to a subtreasury, and the necessary cost of transporting internal-revenue receipts to such places or ports as pay a large amount of customs to the Government, in order that an equal amount to such customs may be returned to the channels of trade by the deposit of the internal revenues transferred for that purpose.

The internal-revenue receipts last year were \$249,150,212.91, while the amount to-day deposited in the national banks is only \$140,727,976.54, showing that the internal-revenue receipts largely exceed the bank deposits.

In support of the assertion that, commercially speaking, this change in the law will have little or no effect, I desire to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that on May 9, 1906, the cash in the Treasury was \$139,622,790.94, and that the liabilities outstanding against this amount were \$102,492,007.36, leaving a working balance of only \$37,130,783.58, or \$13,000,000 less than the assumed working balance of \$50,000,000.

As the law stands to-day, the Secretary of the Treasury could pay all the current expenses out of the customs receipts, and reserve the internal revenues, of which there have already been this year received \$174,194,924.86, to deposit with the banks.

The matter resolves itself down to the mental attitude of the Secretary of the Treasury with regard to the current deposits of Government receipts. With the amendment, he may or may not from day to day redeposit all the customs receipts the Government may receive in the banks at the points where they are paid in, down to the assumed working balance of \$50,000,000, and thereby save the cost of transporting internal revenues of the same amount to the points at which the customs are received. We have simply lopped off a branch long since dead.

Mr. Speaker, these questions suggested by this bill will never be settled until they are settled upon sound, economic principles—principles as certain in their operation as the laws of gravitation. Nor will any handicap be so heavy in our competition with the commercial world as the burden of bungling patchwork that precludes us from being what we ought already to have become—the leading, the controlling financial center of the world.

As it is, our methods in finance and currency only excite the derision of the financial centers of Europe; for they realize that if we but had the intelligence, courage, and patriotism to solve this one problem the world would take its financial cue from the United States every hour of the day the whole year round.

Think of these stupendous facts: The coal production of the United Kingdom, Germany, and France amounts to 422,671,000 gross tons, while that of the United States is 350,820,840 gross tons. Their production of pig iron is 23,319,000 gross tons, while ours is 22,992,380 gross tons. Their exports amount to \$3,908,489,100, while ours are \$1,717,953,382. Their railway mileage at the end of 1905 amounted to 80,984 miles, while ours amounted to 217,018 miles. Their gross receipts from operation of railways was \$1,317,851,000, while ours was \$2,082,482,406.

Comparative industrial and commercial statistics of the United States for the years 1900 and 1905.

	1900.	1905.	Increase.
			Per cent.
Value of agricultural products.....	\$4,717,070,000	\$6,415,000,000	36
Value of mineral products.....	\$1,107,020,352	\$1,623,877,127	46.7
Value of manufactures.....	\$11,411,121,122	\$14,802,147,087	29.7
Production of coal.....gross tons..	240,789,310	350,820,840	45.7
Production of pig iron.....do.....	13,789,242	22,992,380	66.7
Imports for consumption.....	\$807,763,301	\$1,213,417,649	50.2
Domestic exports.....	\$1,460,462,806	\$1,717,953,382	17.6
Mileage of railways.....miles..	192,941	217,018	12.5
Gross receipts from operation of railways.....	\$1,487,044,814	\$2,082,482,406	40

\* 1900 census figures and 1905 figures of the Department of Agriculture, respectively.

\* Figures for the years ending June 30, 1901 and 1906, respectively.

\* Figures for the years ending June 30, 1900 and 1905, respectively.

## Principal industrial and commercial statistics of the leading foreign countries for 1905.

	Production of coal.	Production of pig iron.	Imports for consumption.
	Gross tons.	Gross tons.	
United Kingdom.....	236,129,000	9,593,000	<sup>a</sup> \$2,371,153,000
Germany.....	171,034,000	10,703,000	1,696,660,400
France.....	35,478,000	3,023,000	922,329,200
Total.....	442,671,000	23,319,000	4,990,142,600
United States.....	350,820,840	22,992,380	1,213,417,649

	Domestic exports.	Mileage of railways at end of year.	Gross receipts from operation of railways.
		Miles.	
United Kingdom.....	\$1,605,053,000	22,847	\$511,623,000
Germany.....	1,364,130,800	<sup>b</sup> 33,443	<sup>b</sup> 502,276,000
France.....	939,305,300	24,694	<sup>c</sup> 303,952,000
Total.....	3,908,489,100	80,984	1,317,851,000
United States.....	1,717,953,382	217,018	2,082,482,406

<sup>a</sup> Net imports equal general imports less exports of foreign and colonial merchandise.

<sup>b</sup> Year ending March 31, 1905.

<sup>c</sup> Total gross receipts.

## BANKING POWER OF THE WORLD.

Remember this, that while the banking power of the United States is \$16,000,000,000 and that of all the rest of the world is but \$21,000,000,000, we have a little over \$500,000,000 of what we call bank notes, and the rest of the world has more than \$4,000,000,000 of credit notes with which to carry on trade.

The banking power of the United States in 1906, as represented by capital, surplus, other profits, deposits, and circulation of national and other reporting banks, together with estimated amount of funds of this character in nonreporting banks, is shown to be \$16,462,470,465. The items composing this fund are stated in the accompanying table:

Classification.	Number.	Capital.	Surplus, etc.
National banks.....	6,053	\$826,129,785	\$665,163,368
State, etc., banks.....	11,852	739,163,401	893,679,524
Nonreporting banks <sup>a</sup> .....	3,491	75,356,000	33,280,000
Total.....	21,396	1,640,649,186	1,592,122,892

Classification.	Deposits.	Circulation.	Total.
National banks.....	<sup>b</sup> \$4,145,783,632	\$510,860,726	\$6,147,937,511
State, etc., banks.....	8,159,894,029		9,792,776,954
Nonreporting banks <sup>a</sup> .....	413,160,000		521,791,000
Total.....	12,718,837,661	510,860,726	16,462,470,465

<sup>a</sup> Estimated capital, etc., based on reports received from private banks.

<sup>b</sup> Includes Government deposits.

## Average wholesale prices of forty-one commodities, 1890 to 1897, and 1906.

[From Bulletin No. 63 and advance figures of Bulletin No. 69 of the United States Bureau of Labor.]

Commodities and markets.	Percentage of 1894-1898 prices.									
	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1893 to 1897, inclusive.	1906.
Wheat, Chicago (bushel).....	128.3	138.2	113.2	97.3	80.3	86.2	92.1	114.2	94.0	114.0
Corn, Chicago (bushel).....	119.3	173.5	136.0	119.8	130.7	119.5	77.9	76.9	105.0	139.9
Oats, Chicago (bushel).....	134.1	167.2	131.3	122.1	134.3	102.5	77.8	78.8	103.1	141.7
Barley, Chicago (bushel).....	126.6	152.6	127.2	117.2	128.4	107.6	74.5	80.7	101.7	128.0
Cotton, New York (pound).....	144.2	111.9	99.9	108.2	91.1	94.9	103.0	93.0	98.0	143.4
Cattle: Steers, good to choice, Chicago (100 pounds).....	88.5	109.0	96.2	103.5	96.7	105.5	91.3	102.1	93.8	114.5
Hides, Chicago (pound).....	100.9	102.8	94.1	81.0	69.3	111.1	87.7	107.7	91.4	166.8
Beef, fresh, sides, New York (pound).....	111.4	132.6	123.4	131.6	121.1	128.2	113.0	124.5	123.7	126.3
Hogs, heavy, Chicago (100 pounds).....	98.8	110.5	128.9	163.7	124.3	106.9	83.9	89.7	113.7	155.9
Hams, smoked, Chicago (pound).....	107.9	106.5	116.7	135.5	110.5	102.7	102.3	97.0	109.5	133.9
Lard, New York (pound).....	109.6	114.3	133.5	178.3	133.8	113.1	81.2	76.4	116.5	153.6
Butter, creamery, Elgin (pound).....	114.5	127.9	129.3	132.0	112.2	105.6	91.7	94.0	107.1	125.8
Cheese, New York (pound).....	132.2	107.9	112.9	114.8	113.1	99.1	96.9	103.3	105.4	140.1
Eggs, fresh, New York (dozen).....	106.8	118.6	118.9	123.3	100.7	109.9	95.6	94.3	104.8	143.5
Molasses, New Orleans, New York (gallon).....	117.1	92.2	105.4	110.6	102.2	102.0	107.3	86.5	101.8	112.4
Dried apples, New York (pound).....	132.2	158.1	81.0	97.3	120.9	92.1	59.8	51.1	84.3	101.9
Sugar, granulated, New York (pound).....	172.2	131.6	121.6	135.0	114.8	116.0	126.6	125.6	123.6	126.1
Coffee, Rio, New York (pound).....	151.8	141.5	121.1	145.9	140.1	134.8	104.4	67.1	118.5	68.7
Beans, New York (bushel).....	142.9	158.7	131.7	140.2	130.1	126.1	82.7	73.6	110.5	133.8
Rice, New York (pound).....	110.8	116.7	104.2	84.1	96.3	97.6	95.1	99.3	94.5	86.8
Sheep, western, Chicago (100 pounds).....	136.0	133.3	142.0	120.3	86.9	90.2	91.6	109.9	99.8	153.9
Wool, Ohio medium fleece, Boston (pound).....	163.3	154.7	140.2	122.8	94.2	87.2	84.7	106.3	99.0	136.2
Hay, timothy, Chicago (ton).....	102.2	125.6	121.0	114.6	106.5	116.4	105.6	86.3	105.9	132.5
Hops, New York (pound).....	214.3	215.9	204.8	185.7	123.9	76.9	71.7	94.8	110.6	133.2
Salt, Chicago (barrel).....	117.5	116.7	112.4	104.2	106.7	104.2	92.4	98.1	101.1	106.0
Flour, winter wheat, New York (barrel).....	128.5	135.4	113.8	90.7	75.9	83.2	100.0	120.4	95.2	99.8
Codfish, Boston (quintal).....	114.1	135.3	141.8	128.2	119.8	111.0	84.6	90.9	106.9	152.9

From the latest and most reliable data obtainable the banking power of the foreign countries is estimated at \$21,952,500,000, the details being set forth in the following table:

Banks.	Capital.	Surplus.	Deposits.	Circulation.	Total.
	Millions.	Millions.	Millions.	Millions.	Millions.
Principal European and other foreign banks.....	\$1,364.7	<sup>a</sup> \$587.4	\$7,642.7	\$4,111.8	\$13,706.6
Foreign savings banks.....			8,245.9		8,245.9
Total.....	1,364.7	587.4	15,888.6	4,111.8	21,952.5

<sup>a</sup> Estimated.

Mulhall estimated the world's banking power in 1890 at \$15,985,000,000, the United States being credited with about one-third of that amount. Since that year the banking power of the United States has increased to the extent of \$11,312,400,000, or over 219 per cent; that of the foreign countries, \$11,117,500,000, or 102.6 per cent; and the combined banking power, \$22,429,900,000, or 140.3 per cent.

The statement following, relating to the banking power of the world in 1890 and 1906, shows also the amounts and percentages of increase in 1906 over 1890:

Classification.	1890.	1906.	Increase.	
			Amount.	Per cent.
Banking power of the United States.....	Millions. \$5,150	Millions. \$16,462.4	Millions. \$11,312.4	219.6
Banking power of foreign countries.....	10,835	21,952.5	11,117.5	102.6
Banking power of the world.....	15,985	38,414.9	22,429.9	140.3

Let us remember that of all the great questions confronting this country to-day none is to be compared with the importance of a sound and scientific financial system; one that automatically coordinates itself with the gigantic changes that are going on in the commercial world, and will give to the United States a mechanism of exchange as economic as sound credits and conservatism will permit.

No human mind can comprehend the frightful danger and wasteful disaster that may be attributable to the condition of our currency or complete want of any true current credit at all.

Already apprehensions are felt that something is wrong; and various excuses or explanations are forthcoming.

We are told that commodities are so far above what they ever were that this is the source of our danger. But is this true? Let us see.

I will insert in my remarks a table showing the prices of the 41 leading commodities selected by the Bureau of Labor for reference:



Average wholesale prices of forty-one commodities, 1890 to 1897, and 1906.—Continued.

Commodities and markets.	Percentage of 1894-1898 prices.									
	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898 to 1897, inclusive.	1906.
Silver, New York (ounce).....	165.4	155.5	137.5	122.9	100.6	104.1	107.1	95.5	106.0	105.8
Copper, New York (pound).....	144.6	119.8	106.0	100.4	87.1	98.7	100.7	103.9	98.2	180.1
Lead, New York (pound).....	129.8	128.9	121.8	110.3	97.6	96.2	88.5	105.6	99.7	173.5
Pig iron, Foundry No. 1, Philadelphia (ton).....	147.3	140.2	126.0	116.2	101.3	104.9	103.7	96.8	104.6	167.9
Lumber, white pine, No. 2, barn, Buffalo (1,000 feet).....	100.9	102.1	103.0	111.9	109.1	103.6	99.1	95.1	103.8	178.7
Hemlock, Pennsylvania, New York (1,000 feet).....	110.8	109.7	108.3	105.7	103.1	98.2	98.3	96.9	100.4	192.8
Shingles, cypress, at mills (1,000).....	130.9	127.0	123.0	117.2	109.4	103.5	97.7	91.8	103.9	126.6
Nails, wire, 8 penny, Pittsburgh (100 pound keg).....	154.2	128.3	113.9	103.6	85.9	110.1	152.1	77.2	105.8	101.8
Barb wire, galvanized, Chicago (100 pounds).....	178.0	160.6	138.0	125.7	108.5	112.1	97.9	89.8	106.8	121.3
Ginghams, Amoskeag, general market (yard).....	136.5	141.9	141.9	137.8	105.9	101.7	103.1	95.6	108.7	123.4
Calico, Cochecho, prints, general market (yard).....	127.5	112.7	127.5	122.5	107.8	102.9	102.9	98.0	106.9	107.8
Cotton flannel, general market (yard).....	130.6	130.6	123.3	109.1	104.4	99.6	104.4	104.4	104.4	137.2
Brick, New York (1,000).....	125.9	109.5	110.7	111.9	95.9	101.9	97.1	94.7	100.3	164.0
Coal, bituminous, Youghiogheny, Cincinnati (bushel).....	112.9	134.2	127.4	128.9	107.8	102.0	97.4	96.9	106.6	134.2
Average per cent, 41 commodities.....	129.1	131.5	122.2	120.3	107.1	104.3	95.7	94.7	104.4	133.8

The foregoing table shows that the prices in 1891 rose to the index number 131, against 133 in 1906.

Nor does this slight increase of only 1½ per cent in the prices of 1891 justify the declaration that gold has depreciated, for the increase in wages would more than account for this trifling advance in fifteen years; but then allowance must be made for the differential growing out of inventions, discoveries, and improved methods of production.

When the crops and general production are more abundant than ever in the history of our country, those of 1906 being upon the average more than 50 per cent above those of 1900, and nothing can be found in the general business situation to excite the suspicion and anxiety already felt, ought we not to look deeper and inquire more closely in order that we may get at the real cause and ascertain whether there is not an explanation, a solution, to this mental condition—nay, more, this financial condition—and remedy the evil before it is too late?

In search of the real reason for the universal caution now felt, I addressed certain queries to the Comptroller of the Currency, and herewith submit them and the detailed information they elicited:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,  
Washington, January 17, 1907.

Sir: In compliance with the request contained in your communication of the 16th instant, for certain information with respect to cash reserves held by national and other banks of the United States, I have the honor to inclose herewith statements prepared in the form indicated in your letter, as follows:

- (1) Aggregate resources and liabilities of national banks on July 14, 1896, and June 18, 1906.
- (2) Aggregate resources and liabilities of State banks, loan and trust companies, savings banks and private banks, 1896.
- (3) Aggregate resources and liabilities of State banks, loan and trust companies, savings banks and private banks, 1906.
- (4) Net deposit liabilities of national banks and reserve held thereon, July 14, 1896, and June 18, 1906.
- (5) Individual deposits of State banks, amount and per cent of cash on hand and balance due from banks, June 30, 1896, and 1906.
- (6) Individual deposits of loan and trust companies, amount and per cent of cash on hand and balance due from banks, June 30, 1896, and 1906.
- (7) Individual deposits in savings banks, amount and per cent of cash on hand, and balance due from banks, June 30, 1896, and 1906.
- (8) Individual deposits of private banks, amount and per cent of cash on hand and balance due from banks, June 30, 1896, and 1906.
- (9) Individual deposits, amount and per cent of cash on hand and balance due from banks, of all banks reporting other than national.
- (10) Net deposit liabilities and reserve held thereon, of commercial banks, savings banks, and all reporting banks together with per capita of deposits, on or about June 30, 1896.
- (11) Money in the United States and distribution per capita.
- (12) Reserve money held by all reporting banks on or about June 30, 1896, and 1906.
- (13) Lawful money in circulation outside of banks on or about June 30, 1896, and 1906.
- (14) Statement indicating the amount required to bring present cash reserve held by national banks and by all commercial banks to ratio of cash reserve held, 1896.

(15) Statement showing cash reserve held by commercial banks of the United States, Canada, Japan, and banks of issue of the principal European countries.

Respectfully,

T. P. KANE,  
Deputy and Acting Comptroller.

Hon. CHARLES N. FOWLER,

Chairman Committee on Banking and Currency,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Aggregate resources and liabilities of the national banks on July 14, 1896, and June 18, 1906.

	July 14, 1896 (3,689 banks).	June 18, 1906 (6,053 banks).
<b>RESOURCES.</b>		
Loans and discounts.....	\$1,959,166,368.99	\$4,206,890,078.33
Overdrafts.....	12,475,642.66	30,034,557.56
United States bonds for circulation.....	227,213,650.00	516,871,650.00
United States bonds for deposits.....	15,928,500.00	66,534,380.00
Other bonds for deposits.....	.....	27,455,331.82
United States bonds on hand.....	12,835,655.00	8,158,300.00
Premiums on United States bonds.....	17,579,015.44	13,172,694.72
Bonds, securities, etc.....	190,262,918.13	651,171,903.32
Banking house, etc.....	78,227,350.23	143,747,117.26
Real estate, etc.....	27,221,722.40	19,349,501.59
Due from national banks.....	116,328,082.38	330,038,966.33
Due from State banks.....	28,388,424.79	127,895,385.53
Due from reserve agents.....	204,384,106.92	587,668,626.51
Checks and other cash items.....	13,601,452.76	31,213,772.60
Clearing-house exchanges.....	75,926,122.93	313,877,664.41
Bills of other banks.....	17,444,746.00	28,283,210.00
Fractional currency.....	999,427.31	1,993,213.71
Specie.....	203,835,449.11	485,987,256.88
Legal-tender notes.....	113,213,290.00	165,246,347.00
United States certificates of deposit.....	27,165,000.00	.....
Five per cent fund with Treasurer.....	9,922,944.49	25,247,287.95
Due from United States Treasurer.....	1,677,206.43	3,890,858.52
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>3,353,797,075.97</b>	<b>7,784,228,113.04</b>
<b>LIABILITIES.</b>		
Capital stock.....	651,144,855.00	826,129,785.00
Surplus fund.....	248,368,423.63	448,858,491.99
Undivided profits.....	83,483,208.76	216,304,875.89
National-bank circulation.....	199,214,049.50	510,860,726.00
State-bank circulation.....	60,393.50	30,966.50
Due to national banks.....	291,990,811.77	796,650,184.46
Due to State banks.....	162,311,142.23	362,693,480.22
Due to savings banks.....	.....	349,804,181.05
Due to reserve agents.....	.....	36,119,635.43
Dividends unpaid.....	2,833,357.12	1,753,347.21
Individual deposits.....	1,668,413,507.62	4,055,873,636.60
United States deposits.....	12,556,149.50	80,922,909.92
Deposits United States disbursing officers.....	2,848,176.20	8,987,085.03
Bonds borrowed.....	.....	42,026,320.00
Notes rediscounted.....	11,846,960.72	7,584,436.68
Bills payable.....	15,920,902.16	29,818,664.73
Reserved for taxes.....	.....	3,138,031.41
Other liabilities.....	2,805,138.26	6,671,354.92
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>3,353,797,075.97</b>	<b>7,784,228,113.04</b>

Resources and liabilities of State banks, loan and trust companies, savings and private banks, 1896.

Classification.	3,708 State banks.	260 loan and trust companies.	988 savings banks.	824 private banks.	Total, 5,780 banks.
<b>RESOURCES.</b>					
Loans on real estate.....	\$42,610,348	\$70,612,944	\$800,193,199	\$11,963,527	\$925,380,018
Loans on collateral security other than real estate.....	105,386,820	249,874,349	50,525,863	12,374,512	418,161,544
Other loans and discounts.....	549,158,728	141,513,656	204,053,701	34,332,329	929,058,414
Overdrafts.....	5,349,902	157,888	415,006	993,011	6,915,307
United States bonds.....	726,888	37,400,637	148,525,375	2,386,416	189,039,316
State, county, and municipal bonds.....	1,384,186	5,243,292	453,491,563	1,066,820	461,175,861
Railroad bonds and stocks.....	66,279	12,464,537	134,559,472	953,621	148,043,909
Bank stocks.....	343,481	707,119	44,016,805	806,189	45,873,594
Other stocks and bonds.....	94,713,727	145,348,966	124,608,472	2,023,544	366,694,709
Due from other banks and bankers.....	116,711,865	79,856,399	87,319,545	12,474,379	295,862,188

## Resources and liabilities of State banks, loan and trust companies, savings and private banks, 1896—Continued.

Classification.	3,708 State banks.	260 loan and trust companies.	988 savings banks.	824 private banks.	Total, 5,780 banks.
<b>RESOURCES—continued.</b>					
Real estate, furniture, and fixtures	\$50,898,479	\$33,163,488	\$46,666,584	\$6,397,314	\$137,125,865
Current expenses and taxes paid	3,853,724	380,954	655,222	643,252	5,533,152
Cash and cash items	26,502,386	2,156,987	1,114,827	507,689	30,281,889
Cash on hand	101,038,641	26,800,871	35,201,523	6,157,561	169,198,601
Other resources	8,442,054	50,100,566	11,960,001	1,277,967	71,780,588
Total	1,107,187,508	855,282,153	2,143,307,163	94,348,131	4,200,124,955
<b>LIABILITIES.</b>					
Capital stock	240,133,835	111,146,973	27,240,505	22,310,086	400,831,399
Surplus fund	70,719,890	62,444,553	148,312,419	5,068,297	286,545,159
Other undivided profits	25,054,582	21,869,059	26,402,574	2,731,328	76,057,543
Dividends unpaid	683,966	414,186			1,098,152
Individual deposits	695,659,914	586,468,156	28,310,191	59,116,378	1,369,554,639
Savings deposits			1,907,156,277		1,907,156,277
Debiture bonds		1,762,598			1,762,598
Due to other banks and bankers	57,762,233	6,149,336	1,098,893	2,409,192	67,419,654
All other liabilities	17,173,088	65,027,292	4,786,304	2,712,850	89,699,534
Total	1,107,187,508	855,282,153	2,143,307,163	94,348,131	4,200,124,955

## Resources and liabilities of State banks, loan and trust companies, savings and private banks, 1906.

Classification.	8,862 State banks.	742 loan and trust companies.	1,319 savings banks.	929 private banks.	Total, 11,852 banks.
<b>RESOURCES.</b>					
Loans on real estate	\$150,759,337	\$166,524,402	\$1,323,729,850	\$12,430,972	\$1,654,444,561
Loans on other collateral security	80,287,952	895,884,351	58,946,703	8,303,090	1,043,422,096
Other loans and discounts	2,009,756,478	547,069,086	293,274,919	72,715,318	2,922,805,801
Overdrafts	32,155,877	939,994	977,543	36,159,743	36,159,743
United States bonds	5,603,389	1,678,160	12,178,254	540,804	20,000,607
State, county, and municipal bonds	10,086,457	17,305,806	140,393,235	1,120,184	168,855,682
Railroad bonds and stocks	2,375,440	46,592,846	346,561,193	625,909	396,155,388
Bank stocks	514,496	10,126,733	25,860,373	170,076	36,671,678
Other stocks, bonds, and securities	394,437,012	684,581,875	1,084,782,527	4,674,732	2,168,476,146
Due from other banks and bankers	513,029,009	289,102,143	156,764,518	24,723,406	983,619,076
Real estate, furniture, and fixtures	108,461,141	86,219,390	52,410,539	6,738,248	253,829,318
Checks and other cash items	89,914,963	9,913,537	102,911	694,234	100,625,675
Cash on hand	231,863,412	70,183,686	23,129,931	6,761,156	334,938,185
Other resources	47,855,354	133,118,525	60,911,699	1,461,812	243,346,890
Total	3,677,050,317	2,959,230,534	3,583,024,195	144,045,800	10,363,350,846
<b>LIABILITIES.</b>					
Capital stock	421,845,705	268,384,337	28,896,367	20,036,992	739,163,401
Surplus fund	170,920,117	348,236,524	206,422,799	6,361,155	731,940,595
Other undivided profits	80,194,691	47,137,096	31,911,510	2,495,632	161,738,929
Dividends unpaid	499,360	440,582		43,838	983,780
Individual deposits	2,741,464,129	2,008,937,790	3,299,544,601	109,947,509	8,159,894,029
Due to other banks and bankers	190,045,500	153,290,831	8,540,751	1,869,285	353,746,367
Other liabilities	72,080,815	132,803,374	7,708,167	3,291,389	215,883,745
Total	3,677,050,317	2,959,230,534	3,583,024,195	144,045,800	10,363,350,846

## NATIONAL BANKS.

Net deposit liabilities and reserve held thereon July 14, 1896, and June 18, 1906.

	July 14, 1896 (3,689 banks).	June 18, 1906 (6,053 banks).
Net deposits	<sup>a</sup> \$1,906,287,780	<sup>b</sup> \$4,819,174,251
Cash reserve in bank	\$344,213,738	\$651,233,603
Per cent cash reserve held	18.06	13.51
Per cent available reserve with reserve agents and 5 per cent redemption fund	11.24	11.39
Per cent cash reserve due from reserve agents and in redemption fund	29.30	26.23

<sup>a</sup> Page 590, Comptroller's report, 1896.<sup>b</sup> Page 204, Comptroller's report, 1906.

## STATE BANKS.

Individual deposits, amount, and per cent of cash on hand and balance due from banks.

	June 30, 1896 (3,708 banks).	June 30, 1906 (8,862 banks).
Individual deposits	\$695,659,914	\$2,741,464,129
Cash on hand	\$101,038,641	\$231,863,412
Per cent cash reserve held	14.52	8.45
Due from banks	\$116,711,865	\$513,029,009
Deduct amount due to banks	\$57,762,233	\$190,045,500
Net amount due from banks	\$58,949,632	\$322,983,509
Per cent balance due from banks	8.47	11.78
Per cent cash reserve and balance due from banks	22.99	20.23

<sup>a</sup> Includes banks of island possessions.

## LOAN AND TRUST COMPANIES.

Individual deposits, amount, and per cent of cash on hand and balance due from banks.

	June 30, 1896 (260 companies).	June 30, 1906 (742 companies).
Individual deposits	\$586,468,156	\$2,008,937,790
Cash on hand	\$26,800,871	\$70,183,686
Per cent cash reserve held	4.56	3.49
Due from banks	\$79,356,399	\$289,102,143
Deduct amount due to banks	\$6,149,336	\$153,290,831
Net amount due from banks	\$73,207,063	\$135,811,312
Per cent balance due from banks	12.48	6.76
Per cent cash reserve held and balance due from banks	17.04	10.25

## SAVINGS BANKS.

Individual deposits in savings banks, amount and per cent of cash on hand and balance due from banks.

	June 30, 1896 (988 banks).	June 30, 1906 (1,319 banks).
Individual deposits	\$1,935,466,468	\$3,299,544,601
Cash on hand	\$35,201,523	\$26,129,931
Per cent cash reserve held	1.81	.79
Due from banks	\$87,319,545	\$156,764,518
Deduct amount due to banks	\$1,098,893	\$8,540,751
Net amount due from banks	\$86,220,652	\$148,223,767
Per cent balance due from banks	4.45	4.49
Per cent cash reserve held and balance due from banks	6.26	5.28



## PRIVATE BANKS.

Individual deposits of private banks, amount and per cent of cash on hand, and balance due from banks.

	June 30, 1896 (824 banks).	June 30, 1906 (929 banks).
Individual deposits.....	\$59,116,378	\$109,947,509
Cash on hand.....	\$6,157,561	\$6,761,156
Per cent cash reserve held.....	10.41	6.15
Due from banks.....	\$12,474,379	\$24,723,406
Deduct amount due to banks.....	\$2,409,192	\$1,869,285
Net amount due from banks.....	\$10,065,187	\$22,854,121
Per cent balance due from banks.....	17.02	20.78
Per cent cash reserve held and balance due from banks.....	27.43	26.92

STATE BANKS, LOAN AND TRUST COMPANIES, SAVINGS AND PRIVATE BANKS.  
Individual deposits, amount and per cent of cash on hand and balance due from banks June 30, 1896 and 1906.

	June 30, 1896 (5,780 banks).	June 30, 1906 (11,852 banks).
Individual deposits.....	\$3,276,710,916	\$8,159,894,029
Cash on hand.....	\$169,198,601	\$331,938,185
Per cent cash reserve held.....	5.16	4.10
Due from banks.....	\$295,862,188	\$983,619,076
Deduct amount due to banks.....	\$67,419,654	\$853,746,367
Net amount due from banks.....	\$228,442,534	\$629,872,709
Per cent balance due from banks.....	6.98	7.71
Per cent cash reserve held and balance due from banks.....	12.14	11.81

## COMMERCIAL AND OTHER BANKS.

Net deposit liabilities and reserve held thereon of commercial banks, savings banks, and all reporting banks, on or about June 30, 1896 and 1906.

	1896.	1906.
Commercial banks:		
Net deposits.....	\$3,247,532,228	\$9,679,523,679
Cash reserve on hand.....	\$478,210,811	\$960,041,857
Per cent cash reserve held.....	14.73	9.92
Per capita deposits in commercial banks.....	\$15.49	\$114.33
Savings banks:		
Deposits in savings banks.....	\$1,935,466,468	\$3,299,544,601
Cash reserve on hand.....	\$35,201,528	\$26,129,931
Per cent cash reserve held.....	1.81	0.79
Per capita deposits.....	\$27.11	\$38.97
All banks:		
Deposits.....	\$5,182,998,706	\$12,979,068,280
Cash reserve held.....	\$513,412,339	\$986,171,788
Per cent cash reserve held.....	9.90	7.60
Per capita deposits.....	\$72.60	\$153.30

\* Exclusive of savings deposits in State banks of Illinois having savings department.

Money in the United States and distribution per capita.

	June 30, 1896.		June 30, 1906.	
	Amount.	Per capita.	Amount.	Per capita.
Total stock of money in the United States.....	\$1,799,900,000	\$25.21	\$3,069,900,000	\$36.26
DISTRIBUTION OF MONEY IN THE UNITED STATES.				
Money in Treasury as assets.....	293,500,000	4.11	325,400,000	3.84
Money in reporting banks (national, State, etc.).....	531,800,000	7.45	\$1,016,400,000	12.01
Money in circulation outside of banks and the Treasury.....	974,600,000	13.65	1,728,100,000	20.41
Total.....	1,799,900,000	25.21	3,069,900,000	36.26

\* Includes \$5,661,868 in banks of island possessions.

Comparative statement showing cash reserve held by commercial banks of the United States and by banks of foreign countries on or about June 30, 1906.

Country.	Number of banks.	Deposits.	Cash reserve in bank.	
			Amount.	Per cent.
United States:				
National banks.....	6,053	\$4,819,174,251	\$851,233,603	13.51
Other commercial banks.....	10,533	4,860,349,428	308,808,254	6.35
Canada.....	34	Deposits..... Circulation.....	468,700,000 60,100,000	
			528,800,000	9.21
Scotland (Bank of Scotland and joint stock banks).....	11	Deposits..... Circulation.....	505,310,000 37,715,000	
			543,025,000	22.20

\* Amount due to banks not included.

† Specie and Dominion notes

‡ Deposits and current accounts.

§ Cash, money at call and short notice.

## Reserve money held by all reporting banks.

	June 30, 1896.	June 30, 1906.
Cash in reporting banks in United States.....	\$531,856,513	\$1,016,448,222
Deduct nonreserve money in banks (national bank notes and fractional currency).....	18,444,173	39,592,396
Total reserve money in banks.....	513,412,340	976,855,826

\* Nonreserve money so far as known: banks other than national reported \$72,000,000 in 1896 and \$81,000,000 in 1906 as cash "not classified."

The following classification of the currency held by the banks in 1896 and 1906 is presented for the purpose of comparison:

Currency.	1896 (9,469 banks).	1906 (17,877 banks).	Increase.
Gold coin.....	\$149,260,431	\$156,699,578	\$7,439,147
Gold certificates.....	51,720,400	329,982,467	278,262,067
Silver dollars.....	13,717,838	22,888,827	9,170,989
Silver, fractional.....	5,619,454	11,357,041	5,737,587
Silver certificates.....	29,495,375	101,277,029	71,781,654
Legal-tender notes.....	189,078,207	260,433,306	71,355,099
National bank notes.....	17,444,746	37,599,418	20,154,672
Fractional paper currency, nickels, and cents.....	999,427	1,992,978	993,551
Unclassified specie.....	2,413,485	7,027,629	4,614,144
Unclassified cash.....	72,107,150	81,528,081	9,420,931
Total.....	531,856,513	1,016,448,222	478,929,841
Currency in banks of island possessions.....		5,661,868	5,661,868
Total in banks of country.....	531,856,513	1,016,448,222	484,591,709

## Lawful money in circulation outside of banks.

	June 30, 1896.		June 30, 1906.	
	Amount.	Per capita.	Amount.	Per capita.
Money in banks and in circulation.....	\$1,506,400,000	\$21.10	\$2,744,500,000	\$32.42
Deduct national bank notes in circulation June 30.....	225,556,520	3.16	561,112,360	6.63
Total amount of lawful money in circulation.....	1,280,843,480	17.94	2,183,387,640	25.79
Deduct lawful money in banks.....	513,412,340	7.19	976,855,826	11.54
Lawful money in circulation outside of banks, in the hands of the people.....	767,431,140	10.75	1,206,531,814	14.25

\* Includes fractional paper currency, nickels, and cents not permitted to be counted as reserve for national banks.

Statement indicating amount required to bring present cash reserve held by national banks and by all commercial banks in 1906 to ratio of cash reserve held in 1896.

	6,053 national banks.	Per cent of deposits.	16,586 commercial banks.*	Per cent of deposits.
Deposits (net deposits national banks) 1906.....	\$4,819,174,251		\$9,679,523,679	
Amount cash reserve required by national banks to equal per cent held in 1896.....	870,342,869	18.06		
Amount cash reserve required by all commercial banks to equal cash reserve held in 1896.....			1,425,793,837	14.73
Actual amount and per cent of cash reserve held, 1906.....	651,233,603	13.51	960,041,857	9.92
Additional amount required to increase cash reserves to ratios held in 1896.....	219,109,266		465,751,980	

\* National banks included; savings banks excluded.

Comparative statement showing cash reserve held by commercial banks of the United States and by banks of foreign countries on or about June 30, 1906—Continued.

Country.	Number of banks.	Deposits.	Cash reserve in bank.	
			Amount.	Per cent.
Ireland (Bank of Ireland and joint stock banks).....	9	Deposits..... <i>a</i> \$269,795,000 Circulation..... 30,530,000 300,325,000	<i>b</i> \$19,880,000	16.61
England and Wales (Bank of England and joint stock banks).....	58	Deposits..... <i>a</i> 3,418,940,000 Circulation..... 148,965,000 3,567,905,000	<i>b</i> 1,025,690,000	28.74
United Kingdom <i>c</i> .....	92	Deposits..... <i>a</i> 4,336,505,000 Circulation..... 217,955,000 4,554,460,000	<i>b</i> 1,231,220,000	27.03
Germany (Imperial Bank and other banks of issue).....		Deposits..... 168,000,000 Circulation..... 449,500,000 617,500,000	<i>d</i> 227,200,000	36.79
France (Bank of France).....		Deposits..... <i>a</i> 189,100,000 Circulation..... 908,800,000 1,097,900,000	803,400,000	73.17
Austria-Hungary (Bank of Austria-Hungary).....		Deposits..... 31,100,000 Circulation..... 376,500,000 407,600,000	299,200,000	73.40
Japan (Imperial and other banks), December, 1905.....	2,243	Deposits..... 717,658,000 Circulation..... 160,900,000 877,958,000	111,158,000	12.66

*a* Deposits and current accounts.  
*b* Cash, money at call and short notice.

*c* Joint stock, colonial and foreign banks with London offices not included.  
*d* Specie.

My thought was that our reserves must have fallen, and yet, with an increase in our gold supply of \$873,397,245, from 1896 to 1906, it would seem at first blush as though this could not be, nor could it be if this vast amount of gold had gone into the banks where it belonged. But it did not go into the banks as it should, except in part. The banks got \$433,000,000, and the people pocketed a little more than half of it, or \$433,000,000.

Can any Member of this House tell me of what earthly use the \$1,206,531,814 of reserve money, now in the pockets and tills of the people, is to the commerce of the United States, except as a medium of exchange which credit could perform as well?

It would take \$465,751,980 to raise the reserves in the banks of the United States up to the ratios we held in 1896. The total reserves held by all the banks in the United States in 1906 were \$960,041,857, or \$250,000,000 less than the amount of the reserve money the people were using in trade. For all commercial purposes, except as a medium of exchange, it might just as well be in the bowels of the earth as in the pockets and tills of the people.

In fifteen years our population has increased 15,000,000, and the per capita pocket and till money of our people has gone up from \$13.65 to \$20.41, due undoubtedly to greater prosperity, higher wages, and better living. Of this \$20.41 in circulation outside of the Treasury and the banks \$15 is reserve money.

But can anyone explain to this House why a man should carry a check book, or demand credit, in his side coat pocket, and a gold certificate in his vest pocket? Why not the same kind of a credit in both pockets, except in this that one is a bank-book credit and the other a bank-note credit; the one a credit subject to order, the other a current credit?

Until we come to realize that it is the right of the mass of the people to have the same cheap or economic tool of trade as those who use check books, we shall fail utterly in our attempt to measure swords in the commercial world with the most advanced countries upon equal terms. Certainly every obvious advantage should be seized at once.

Let us settle once for all what a banker really is and what is his duty.

He is a merchant in credit and it is his duty to furnish to his customers the kind of credit they may ask for. If they want a book credit subject to check, the banker should give it to them. If they want current credit that passes by delivery, the banker should give it to them and keep it good by redemption in gold coin, which is insured by ample reserves.

The farmer, bringing to town his potatoes, corn, hogs, cattle, wheat, cotton, and other products, sells them to the local buyer, and getting his pay seeks the banker to sell his credit in the form of a deposit, upon which the banker pays him anywhere from 1 per cent to 3 per cent or possibly 5 per cent, just according

to how large the deposit is and how long it is to remain with the banker.

The banker in return sells this credit, for which he is paying one rate of interest, to some other farmer or local dealer for a higher rate of interest. In other words, the banker is buying and selling credit, precisely as the local grain and stock dealer buys and sells produce, shipping it to other cities or commodity centers. So, too, the banker will send away all his access of credits to the market where he can sell them at the best price. As a result, we have a cotton market at New Orleans, a meat and grain market at Chicago, and a credit market at New York.

The loans made by the bankers, or credits sold by them, are approximately equal to the credits bought by them or the deposits made with them. To illustrate; September 4, 1906, the loans of the national banks amounted to \$4,298,983,316.11, and the individual deposits were \$4,199,938,310.35.

To compel the great mass of our people to carry about with them the actual gold coin in the form of certificates instead of a bank credit is as unjust to the people and as absurd as to pass a law to compel all farmers to bring their products to market in wagons with gold tires. Who would pay for the tires? Who pays the cost of a gold instead of a credit currency? Do you think the bankers pay it? Who is carrying the load imposed by a system that puts \$1,200,000,000 of gold or reserve money into the pockets of the people instead of a current credit convertible into gold?

Do you think the bankers are paying the cost? Are they paying it any more than the stock, grain, and cotton buyers would pay for the gold tires were so onerous a burden imposed upon the productive industries of the country? What would the effect be upon the interest rates paid by the people, if one thousand millions or a billion of the reserves now locked up in the pockets of the people were in the banks where they would sustain loans of more than five thousand millions of dollars with a reserve of 20 per cent, or if the present average reserve of our country be taken, which is only 7.60 per cent, nearly three times five thousand millions, or fifteen thousand millions—three thousand millions more than all the loans in all the banks in the United States—which are now \$12,000,000,000.

But our reserves are too low, and should be largely increased, and this is the very heart of this whole question.

Our people are using the reserves of the country as a medium of exchange when current credits should do this work, rising and falling in quantity precisely as the demand comes and goes, reflecting as perfectly the variation in cash transactions as our checks and drafts reflect the transactions in bank credits. Increased wages and increased cost of living have made a greater and greater demand for cash; and while the people have been



absorbing our reserves, the business of the country has gone on increasing, and the bankers have sold credits to such an extent, or, what is the same thing, have made loans to such an extent, that the reserves have gradually become smaller relatively since 1896, until now they are only 9.92 per cent against 14.73 per cent in 1896 in all the commercial banks—national, state, trust companies, and private banks—while including the savings banks they are only 7.6 per cent to-day against 9.90 per cent in 1896.

If one-third of the reserves hidden in the pockets of the people or the gold they have taken from the channels of trade since 1896 was in the banks, the ratio of our reserves would be as high as in 1896, and if two-thirds of the reserves lodged in the pockets of the people were in the commercial banks of the country, our reserves would be 20 per cent of our deposits.

Thus it is clear that the reserves in the country are more than ample for any apparent demand for credit, however great that may seem to be, if only they were in the bank vaults instead of in the pockets of the people.

Thus it happens that the condition of our national finances is such that the people are constantly absorbing more and more of our reserves as the times become more prosperous. Indeed, our financial and currency policy is such that our prosperity must inevitably lead to the destruction of that very prosperity—an anomaly, but the direct and natural fruit of our ignorance and wasteful folly.

Nor shall we escape the evil consequences of this condition, which will come to us in various ways, until we recognize two or three great economic truths and construct a financial and currency system upon them.

The first is that the place for our reserves is in our bank vaults, and not in the pockets and tills of the people.

The second is that there is not the slightest difference between bank-book credits and bank-note credits.

The third is that the required reserves should be ample; the bank-note credits passing with perfect facility into the bank-note credits, and both currently convertible into the reserves.

When we recognize and adopt these principles, incorporating them into a system, our rates of interest will become practically uniform throughout the country and throughout the year, and not England, but the United States will be the financial center and the world's commercial bills of exchange will bear the signet of the eagle and not of the lion and the unicorn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey to concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the House proceeded to divide.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, to save the time of the House, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 160, nays 72, answered "present" 2, not voting 143, as follows:

## YEAS—160.

Allen, Me.	Dunwell	Kline	Powers
Allen, N. J.	Ellis	Knapp	Prince
Andrus	Englebright	Knopf	Reeder
Barchfeld	Esch	Knowland	Reynolds
Bates	Fassett	Lacey	Riordan
Bede	Fitzgerald	Lafean	Rodenberg
Bennet, N. Y.	Fordney	Landis, Chas. B.	Ruppert
Birdsall	Foss	Landis, Frederick	Scott
Bonyuge	Foster, Ind.	Littauer	Shartel
Brick	Foster, Vt.	Littlefield	Sherman
Brooks, Colo.	Fowler	Longworth	Sibley
Burke, S. Dak.	French	Lorimer	Smith, Ill.
Burleigh	Gaines, W. Va.	Loud	Smith, Iowa
Burton, Del.	Gardner, Mass.	Loudenslager	Smith, Mich.
Burton, Ohio	Gardner, Mich.	Loving	Smith, Pa.
Calder	Gardner, N. J.	Lowden	Smyser
Calderhead	Gilham	McCreary, Pa.	Snapp
Campbell, Kans.	Graff	McKinley, Ill.	Southard
Capron	Graham	McKinney	Steenerson
Cassel	Granger	McMorran	Stevens, Minn.
Chaney	Greene	McNary	Sullivan
Chapman	Gronna	Mahon	Sulloway
Cocks	Grosvenor	Mann	Tawney
Cole	Hamilton	Marshall	Taylor, Ohio
Conner	Haskins	Martin	Townsend
Cooper, Pa.	Hayes	Meyer	Volstead
Cousins	Henry, Conn.	Miller	Vreeland
Cromer	Hepburn	Mondell	Wadsworth
Crumpacker	Higgins	Moore, Pa.	Waldo
Currier	Hill, Conn.	Mouser	Wanger
Cushman	Howell, N. J.	Mudd	Washburn
Dalzell	Hubbard	Needham	Watson
Darragh	Hull	Norris	Weeks
Davidson	Humphrey, Wash.	Olcott	Weems
Dawson	Jones, Wash.	Olmsted	Wharton
Deemer	Kahn	Padgett	Wiley, N. J.
Denby	Kellher	Parker	Wilson
Dixon, Mont.	Kennedy, Nebr.	Parsons	Wood
Draper	Kennedy, Ohio	Payne	Woodyard
Driscoll	Kinkaid	Perkins	

## NAYS—72.

Adamson	Beall, Tex.	Brantley	Burleson
Alken	Bell, Ga.	Brum	Burnett
Bartlett	Bowers	Brundidge	Candler

Clark, Mo.	Heflin	Moon, Tenn.	Sims
Clayton	Hill, Miss.	Murdock	Slayden
Cooper, Wis.	Hinshaw	Nelson	Small
Dawes	Houston	Otjen	Smith, Ky.
De Armond	Howard	Overstreet, Ga.	Smith, Md.
Dixon, Ind.	Humphreys, Miss.	Rainey	Smith, Tex.
Finley	Hunt	Randall, Tex.	Stephens, Tex.
Flood	James	Richardson, Ala.	Sulzer
Gaines, Tenn.	Lamar	Robinson, Ark.	Talbot
Garrett	Lee	Rucker	Thomas, N. C.
Gill	Legare	Russell	Trimble
Gillespie	Lever	Ryan	Watkins
Glass	Lewis	Shackelford	Webb
Gregg	Lloyd	Sheppard	Williams
Hay	Macon	Sherley	Zenor

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kelfer	Wallace
--------	---------

## NOT VOTING—143.

Acheson	Dresser	Klepper	Reid
Alexander	Dwight	Lamb	Rhinock
Ames	Edwards	Law	Rhodes
Babcock	Ellerbe	Lawrence	Richardson, Ky.
Bankhead	Field	Le Fevre	Rives
Bannon	Fletcher	Lilley, Pa.	Roberts
Bartholdt	Floyd	Lilley, Conn.	Robertson, La.
Beldier	Fulkerson	Lindsay	Samuel
Bennett, Ky.	Fuller	Livingston	Sanders
Bingham	Garber	McCall	Schneebell
Bishop	Garner	McCarthy	Scroggy
Blackburn	Gilbert	McCleary, Minn.	Slemp
Boutell	Gillett	McDermott	Smith, Cal.
Bowersock	Goebel	McGavin	Southall
Bowie	Goldfogle	McKinlay, Cal.	Southwick
Bradley	Goulden	McLachlan	Sparkman
Broocks, Tex.	Griggs	McLain	Sperry
Broussard	Gudger	Madden	Spight
Brown	Hale	Maynard	Stafford
Brownlow	Hardwick	Michalek	Stanley
Buckman	Haugen	Minor	Sterling
Burgess	Hearst	Moon, Pa.	Taylor, Ala.
Burke, Pa.	Hedge	Moore, Tex.	Thomas, Ohio
Butler, Pa.	Henry, Tex.	Morrell	Tirrell
Butler, Tenn.	Hermann	Murphy	Towne
Byrd	Hogg	Nevin	Tyndall
Campbell, Ohio	Holliday	Overstreet, Ind.	Underwood
Clark, Fla.	Hopkins	Page	Van Duzer
Cockran	Howell, Utah	Palmer	Van Winkle
Coudry	Huff	Patterson, N. C.	Wachter
Dale	Hughes	Patterson, S. C.	Webber
Daye, Va.	Jenkins	Pearre	Weisse
Davis, Minn.	Johnson	Pollard	Welborn
Davis, W. Va.	Jones, Va.	Pou	Wiley, Ala.
Dickson, Ill.	Kitchin, Claude	Pujo	Young
Dovener	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Ransdell, La.	

So the motion to concur in the Senate amendments was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. HALE with Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POUL.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. LAMB.

Mr. HALE with Mr. PAGE.

Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of California with Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina.

Mr. SPERRY with Mr. SOUTHALL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. FOWLER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I objected to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Upon cooler reflection I desire to withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi withdraws his objection to the gentleman from New Jersey printing his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Extending his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman.

## IMMIGRATION STATION AT CHARLESTON.

Mr. LEGARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25719) to provide for the establishment of an immigration station at Charleston, in the State of South Carolina, and the erection in said city, on a site to be selected for said station, of a public building.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to establish an immigration station at the city of Charleston, in the State of South Carolina, and to cause to be erected, on a site to be selected, a public building to temporarily accommodate and care for immigrants arriving at said city.

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$70,000 is hereby appropriated for the erec-

tion of said building, which sum shall be paid from the permanent appropriation for expenses of regulating immigration, said sum to include heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

After section 1 insert the following:

"Provided, That the land and dock room necessary for said station and building to be transferred to the Government of the United States free of any cost to the United States."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "the," strike out the words "permanent appropriation for expenses of regulating immigration" and insert in lieu thereof the words "immigrant fund."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

[Mr. BENNET of New York addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEGARE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### IMMIGRATION STATION AT NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 7247) to provide for the establishment of an immigration station at New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, and the erection in said city, on a site to be selected for said station, of a public building.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to establish an immigration station at the city of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, and to cause to be erected on a site to be selected a public building to temporarily accommodate and care for immigrants arriving at said city: *Provided*, That the land and dock room necessary for said station and building be transferred to the Government of the United States free of any cost to the United States.

Sec. 2. That the sum of \$70,000 is hereby appropriated for the erection of said building, which sum shall be paid from the permanent appropriation for expenses of regulating immigration, said sum to include heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Secretary of Commerce and Labor." Page 2, line 3, after the word "the," strike out "permanent appropriation of expenses of regulating immigration" and insert "immigrant fund."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, the authorization of these new immigration stations, which for the first time place some southern ports on an equality with northern and western ones, calls attention especially at this time to the tide of immigration now setting so strongly toward us. There are many reasons for it. Prosperity among us, admiration for our form of Government, the fertility of our lands, and the happy experiences of friends and relatives bring to us thousands. With these voluntary immigrants we are, perhaps, entitled to exercise a high degree of care and scrutiny. But there is another class to whom, if true to our traditions, we owe a duty of maintaining a land of liberty and of refuge. This class is the refugee fleeing from persecution and dangers in his native land; to him we must temper scrutiny with mercy.

The present conditions in Russia are sending us thousands of unwilling immigrants, who leave their homes with as much reluctance as any of us possibly could ours. Not only must we receive these unfortunates, but if within our proper power we must also do what we can to remove the cause of their dire distress. Heretofore we have been advised that we were without power, but it is now suggested that this view is inaccurate. Distinguished lawyers and public citizens have united in a request to the Congress in the following form:

We, the undersigned, believe that the time has come when civilized nations may, and of right ought to, protest against the atrocities practiced by the Russian Government in its prolonged warfare against its own people.

The subject is one which interests all nations as a matter of common humanity. On more than one occasion governments have taken action for the amelioration or termination of abhorrent conditions existing in foreign countries. Many instances might be cited, but we content ourselves, as sufficient for our present purposes, in citing the case of the Bulgarian atrocities in 1877, when Russia, taking advantage of the general horror excited by the inhumanities of the Turkish forces within the dominions of the Sultan, intervened, in the name of humanity, to rescue the inhabitants of Bulgaria from their deplorable condition. Fifty years before various European powers, of whom Russia was one, intervened by force to redeem the Greek inhabitants of the Sultan's dominions from barbarities and oppression. In seeking now some means of inducing the Russian Government to ameliorate the condition of its subjects we are asking nothing for which the Russian Government has not itself in times past afforded a sufficient precedent.

This petition and protest rest solely and entirely upon the instances wherein the Russian Government has been and is disregardful of the obligations of a government toward its subjects as recognized by all

civilized nations, and wherein it is guilty within its borders of flagrant violation of the terms of agreement of the Geneva treaty of 1864 and 1868 between the nations, and also of the second convention of the peace conference at The Hague in 1902, which forbid such acts of cruelty toward foreign enemies in time of war.

Knowledge of the facts involved has come from many and most varied sources—among others, reports both official and unofficial. A body of testimony has thus been accumulated, which produces upon the mind the irresistible conviction of the sad truth of these direful conditions. The principal facts may be grouped under the following heads:

(a) Thousands of men and women are dragged from their homes solely at the discretion or pleasure of local military or police authorities and "administratively" exiled without trial or examination and consigned to inevitable starvation and placed in the midst of remote settlements of semisavages (Ostiaks and Yakuts), close to and within the polar circle, where the most loathsome diseases are chronically epidemic. (See reports St. Petersburg "Society for Helping Political Prisoners and Exiles," 1906.)

(b) Hospitals are deliberately fired upon by the regular troops without rebuke. (See governmental and Douma committee reports on Kishenev, Homel, Bialostok, and Seidlitz Pogroms.)

(c) The Red Cross is not respected, and the wounded are frequently slaughtered or thrown into the sea or buried alive with the dead. (See above reports on Pogroms; also the reports on the uprisings at Moscow, December, 1905, and at Sebastopol and Kronstadt, and also Klimkof report on the Baltic provinces. See Arts. II, III, V, XI, Geneva convention, 1864; also minutes second convention at The Hague, 1902, Art. XXIII, Secs. B and C.)

(d) Women, children, and aged and decrepit men—patently noncombatants—are maimed and killed by sword slashings, torn by bayonets, and trampled under hoofs of horses. (See report on pogroms; also report of Klimkof on Moscow, 1905; also official reports on events in Koursk, October, 1905. See minutes of the above convention, Art. XXV.)

(e) Girls and young women inhabitants of districts under military "protection" are repeatedly given over to violation by officers as well as ordinary soldiers. (See reports on pogroms by Governmental Commissioners Turau, Kouzminsky, Savich, and Douma committee of investigation; report of Pietoukhof on Seidlitz; also report on the trial of Kishenev; investigation of society of Caucasian lawyers on Armenian massacres, Tiflis; and preliminary reports of official commission on the same subject, presided over by Veldenbaum.)

(f) Hundreds of homes are burned without warrant or reason at the mere whim and will of commanding officers. (See preliminary examination report of the Veldenbaum commission; the Captain Pietoukhof report on Seidlitz. See also Albert Edwards in Collier's Weekly—affidavit certifying statements—and Kellogg Durland interview with General Alkanoff in the New York Evening Post, October 6, 1906—affidavit certifying statement; also minutes of the second convention at The Hague, Arts. XXV and XXVIII.)

(g) Tortures are applied to prisoners within fortresses and prisons to elicit information. (See Klimkof report and official complaints to ministers of justice; reports of Vladimiroff—Sunday World, January 27, 1907—affidavit certifying statements.)

(h) Field courts-martial endeavor to confuse ordinary civil offenses with revolutionary acts, leading to the almost daily execution of offenders who in civilized lands would receive the most trivial sentences. (See official proclamation through minister of war, 26th of August, 1906, and constantly appearing newspaper dispatches, for example, "Three persons hanged in public gardens in Odessa for stealing \$3.50, etc."—Associated Press dispatch, January, 1907.)

(i) Villages are pillaged and looted by soldiers upon and during military occupancy, and by police and gendarmes during and immediately following disturbances—i. e., pogroms or massacres—and without any serious attempts on the part of the Government officials to bring to justice those who have violated their sacred duty of protecting the lives, persons, and property of the individuals, thus indicating governmental complicity or connivance. (See governmental and Douma reports, the Captain Pietoukhof report on Seidlitz, and minutes of the second convention at The Hague, Art. XLVII.—Pillage is absolutely prohibited.)

(j) Massacres are planned and effected by the police and military authorities for the purpose of terrorizing the population in given localities to support specific political aims. ("Pogroms.") (See above reports on "pogroms.")

In view of the present appalling situation in Russia, above indicated; in view of the certainty that the ruthless methods now employed can at best lead to a purely artificial and temporary tranquillity; in view of the fact that the present policy of the Russian Government is a menace to the peace of the world, and in view of the undoubted influence of foreign public opinion upon the action of governments, even the most autocratic, we hereby request the Congress of the United States solemnly to protest against the perverted use of governmental functions, of which the Russian people are the victims.

The petition is signed, among others, by Justice Samuel Greenbaum, New York City; R. Fulton Cutting, New York City; Edwin R. L. Gould, New York City; Samuel L. Clemens, New York City; Jacob H. Schiff, New York City; A. S. Frissell, New York City; Dr. Lyman Abbott, New York City; Bishop Henry C. Potter, New York City; George Kennan, New York City; Charles Stewart Smith, New York City; William Jay Schieffelin, New York City; Julia Ward Howe, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Charles Gordon Ames, Boston, Mass.; E. H. Clement, Boston, Mass.; Louis D. Brandeis, Boston, Mass.; Joseph Lee, Boston, Mass.; Bishop Whittaker, Philadelphia, Pa.; F. Innes Forbes, Philadelphia, Pa.; Julian Kennedy, Pittsburg, Pa.; D. Chris Lange, M. D., Pittsburg, Pa.; H. D. W. English, Pittsburg, Pa.; Judge Cohen, Pittsburg, Pa.; F. H. Babcock, Pittsburg, Pa.; Bishop Regis Canevin, Pittsburg, Pa.; Chancellor Holland, Pittsburg, Pa.; Prof. John A. Brashear, Pittsburg, Pa.; Rev. S. Edward Young, Pittsburg, Pa.; Rev. J. Leonard Levy, Pittsburg, Pa.; A. Leo Weil, Pittsburg, Pa.; Clarence Burleigh, Pittsburg, Pa.; Hon. William S. Woods, Pittsburg, Pa.

It is of course too late at this Congress to take any action



whatever, but in the Sixtieth Congress the views set out in the petition and protest will be vigorously pressed.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MEYER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### IMMIGRANT STATION AT GALVESTON, TEX.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 8327) to provide for the establishment of an immigrant station at Galveston, in the State of Texas, and the erection in said city, on a site to be selected for said station, of a public building.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to establish an immigration station at the city of Galveston, in the State of Texas, and to cause to be erected, on a site to be selected, a public building to temporarily accommodate and care for immigrants arriving at said city: *Provided,* That the land and dock room necessary for said station and building be transferred to the Government of the United States free of any cost to the United States.

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$70,000 is hereby appropriated for the erection of said building, which sum shall be paid from the permanent appropriation for expenses of regulating immigration, said sum to include heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In section 1, line 3, strike out the words "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of Commerce and Labor."

In section 2, page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "permanent appropriation for expenses of regulating immigration" and insert in lieu thereof the words "immigrant fund."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this and the two other bills for new immigrant stations is perhaps a proper occasion to call attention to the changes in the immigration law which, for the most part, go into effect on July 1, 1907. It is believed that the new law will greatly assist in the administration of the immigration law and also exclude certain classes of undesirable immigrants not now excluded.

The changes in the new immigration bill were made for the following reasons, and expected in each instance to accomplish the following purposes:

Section 1: The increase in the tax from \$2 to \$4 is expected to secure a fund of about a million dollars a year, which, paid into the United States Treasury, will recompense indirectly the country for the expenditure which it might make on individual immigrants before they become self-supporting. It is believed that this fund will be ample for that purpose, and if it does not go directly to the States spending the money, it at least goes into a fund of the country.

The change in the exemptions from "citizens of Canada," etc., to "aliens who have lived for a year in the Dominion of Canada," etc., was made for the reason that with increased head tax it was feared that some nation other than those specifically mentioned in the bill would raise the question of our right to extend a privilege to one nation which was not extended to all, and that such objecting nation might raise international questions based upon the most-favored-nation clause which is in most treaties. The words "or contract-labor laws" were inserted so as to make certain that the immigration fund could be used for the enforcement of the contract-labor laws, which are not, strictly speaking, entirely immigration laws.

The exemption of "aliens in transit through the United States" was inserted so as not to discriminate against steamship companies bringing aliens to ports in our country which aliens were destined for other countries.

The exemption of Guam, Porto Rico, and Hawaii from the head tax was made because of the effort which is being made to attract immigrants to those places, and the desire not to put any hindrance in the way of such efforts.

The labor condition maintained at the end of section 1 speaks for itself, and, while possibly useful in relation to the existing Japanese situation, will be useful at any time when industrial conditions become less prosperous; and immigrants who have gone to Canada, the Canal Zone, Guam, Cuba, Porto Rico, or Hawaii commence to feel any possible industrial depression, which would probably strike those places first, and attempt to come to the United States in large numbers, thus complicating what might by that time have become a serious economic problem among ourselves.

In section 2 the addition of imbeciles and feeble-minded persons to the excluded class needs no explanation, and the word

"tuberculosis" is added because there is a controversy as to whether tubercular diseases are dangerous contagious diseases. The words "persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes," etc., are intended to cover persons of low vitality or poor physique, or who should not, for some apparent physical reason, be admitted.

The words "or admit having committed" make a sensible and obvious change.

The words "persons who admit their belief in the practice of polygamy" bar out practicing polygamists, or those who intend practicing polygamy, without affecting some who accept literally the teachings of certain portions of the Old Testament.

The provisions in relation to women and girls speak for themselves, and merely strengthen the existing statutes.

The provision in regard to contract laborers puts back into the law language which was omitted, probably inadvertently, from the act of 1903, and makes it possible once more to enforce the contract-labor law vigorously. For the last four years there has always been a doubt as to whether contract laborers belong specifically to the excluded classes.

The provision in relation to excluding persons whose ticket or passage has been paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government is aimed to prevent the bringing in of undesirable immigrants through the efforts of foreign governments, foreign cities, or benevolent or charitable societies.

The provision in relation to children under 16 years of age is aimed chiefly at the bringing in of Greek boys, who are sold into practical slavery in this country, and the provision as made is liberal, so as not to prevent the coming of all children.

The provision permitting those whose tickets or passage have been paid for by any corporation, association, etc., to go in immediate and continuous transit through the United States to foreign contiguous territory is inserted so as not to discriminate against steamships coming to our ports but bringing such passengers destined for foreign countries.

Section 3 is greatly broadened, so as to make certain the suppression of the immoral practices alluded to in the section. It is said by those connected with the enforcement of the law that the section as amended will permit of very successful efforts in this direction.

The changes in section 4 simplify and strengthen the contract-labor law.

The changes in sections 5, 7, and 8 are simply verbal, and speak for themselves.

In section 9 the addition of the words "idiots, imbeciles, epileptics, or persons afflicted with tuberculosis or with" makes this section, which is the punishment section corresponding with section 2, the excluding section, which heretofore the section did not exactly do. The other changes in the section are purely verbal.

In section 10 the addition of "tuberculosis" to the classes in which final exclusion can be had while extremely important is so simple as to require no explanation.

Section 11 enacts into law what is now the practice—that is, rejecting an accompanying alien in case of the exclusion of an alien rejected for sickness, mental or physical disability.

In section 12 the addition of the words "the name and address of the nearest relative in the country from which the alien came" is to enable the Department to send the alien back to some friend when such alien is rejected because of a mental infirmity.

The final clause of section 12 is new and provides the means for ascertaining how many aliens leave the country each year. This law gives an opportunity, which we have never had before, of finding out what the net increase of population is each year through the incoming aliens.

The changes in section 13 put on the manifest the information which is required for the examinations in sections 2, 3, and 10.

The proviso in section 15 needs no explanation.

The changes in sections 16 and 17 are simply verbal.

The changes in section 18 add railways other than those which have entered into contractual relations with the Department of Commerce and Labor to those liable for the illegal bringing in of aliens, and provide that the liability of those railways and of officers of vessels shall be for negligent failure. These changes strengthen and simplify the law, which was heretofore somewhat vague.

In section 19 the words "or shall make any charge for the return of any such alien, or shall take any security from him for the payment of any such charge," are aimed at preventing steamship companies from bringing aliens to this country, knowing such aliens to be inadmissible, but protecting themselves by taking security on the other side, so that the return passage is paid, the steamship companies thus actually profiting by

bringing to this country people who they know will be sent back. The changes in this section also permit the suspension of the deportation of any alien whose testimony is required in any prosecution for a violation of the immigration law.

In the interest of humanity the section has been amended so as to permit an alien suffering from tuberculosis, or from a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, to be sent to a hospital, if the express permission of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor is obtained. The proviso at the end of the section also permits the detention of an insane alien whose health and safety will be imperiled by immediate deportation.

The changes in section 20 extend the time within which an alien who becomes a public charge, whether from causes existing prior to landing, may be deported, from two to three years, and puts one-half of the entire cost of removal to the port of deportation upon the contractor, procurer, or other person inducing the alien to enter the United States, and if that can not be done, then the cost of removal to the port of deportation shall be at the expense of the immigration fund and at the expense of the steamship company from there on.

Section 21 permits the deportation of any alien, subject to deportation, at any time within three years, and in the proviso at the end of the section is added the humane provision for the employment of a person at the expense of the immigration fund, to accompany an insane or sick alien back to the place from which he or she came.

In section 22 the addition of the words "and also surgeons in accordance with the provision of section 17" enables us to send surgeons to countries where an inspection by them of aliens prior to sailing will be permitted. This will save thousands of aliens, suffering from diseases which would bar them from entry, from taking the voyage, and will save many more thousands from the danger of infection or contagion from such immigrants during the voyage. The system is now, with the consent of the Italian Government, in use in various ports in Italy, and is giving great satisfaction.

In section 24 the appropriation of the lump sum of \$50,000 for the enforcement of the contract-labor law was, in the judgment of the conferees, the only way which could be devised of enforcing the contract-labor law. It is presumed that the Secretary of Commerce and Labor will, from this fund, employ detectives who will be absolutely unknown to everyone connected with the immigration service, and who will be able, by traveling to and fro on the ships, to obtain evidence as to contract laborers.

In section 25 the words "which shall be rendered solely upon the evidence adduced before the board of special inquiry" enact into law a recent regulation of the Department, which supersedes the former bad practice of receiving additional evidence on appeal. As the law now is, if new evidence is discovered after the taking of the appeal the case is sent back to the original board of inquiry, which thus acts both upon the old and the new evidence.

Section 26 permits for the first time the giving of a legal bond in the case of any alien liable to be excluded because likely to become a public charge or because of physical disability from tuberculosis or loathsome, contagious disease, and otherwise admissible. There are thousands of cases in which it is practically impossible to separate families by deporting one or more members of the family who are liable to become public charges. Under this bond section the Government can now secure itself. The section provides for the giving of a bond which can be enforced. The whole record will go up before the Secretary, who can, either on that or on outside evidence, exercise his discretion.

In section 28 the changes enlarge the saving clause of the law.

In section 32 the word "foreign" was stricken out, so as to permit the Bureau to make arrangements with the American railway lines running into the United States similar to existing contracts with Canadian lines on the northern border.

In section 33 the definition of the term "United States" is changed so as to exclude the Isthmian Canal Zone. If this change had not been made, the importation of laborers into the Zone would have been seriously interfered with.

Section 34 prohibits the sale of liquors in the Capitol. It has, of course, no place in the immigration act. It is not repealed, but is simply left out of the act, and the new section 34 permits the appointment of a commissioner of immigration at New Orleans.

Section 36 was the repealing clause of the old law. The new section 36 prohibits aliens from entering the United States except at the seaports thereof or at such place or places as the Secretary of Commerce and Labor may from time to time designate.

Curiously enough, although there was under the old law provision for deporting aliens who were found to be in the United States illegally, there was no provision preventing aliens from coming in wherever they saw fit, whether there was an inspection at the point or not. The proviso is to facilitate the passage of residents of Canada and Mexico across our northern and southern boundaries, respectively.

Section 37 had a curious history. It was drafted by the late Senator Hoar to cover the case of the wife and two children of a Syrian living in Worcester, Mass., and so strictly was this idea followed that it provided for the admission of "said wife and either of said children." It also provided that the act should be applicable only when the contagious disorder was contracted on shipboard, and, curiously enough, after further providing that said wife or children should be held until it should be determined whether the disorder was easily curable, failed to provide whether they should be admitted or deported after such fact was ascertained. The section was a curious example of the evil which generally results from passing a general statute to cover a particular case. The principle, however, was good, and the law now recognizes that a family may consist of either more or less, as well as two children, and strikes out the provision that the disease was contracted on shipboard, which is, of course, immaterial, and provides what the kindly Senator from Massachusetts evidently intended to provide—that is, that if the disease is found to be easily curable the persons can be landed.

Section 39 provides for the appointment of a commission of nine persons, three to be appointed by the President, three Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. The Members of Congress are to serve without compensation and the members appointed by the President are to receive a compensation to be fixed by him. The commission has very wide powers, is not limited in its expenditures, and is required to report to Congress. The intention is to have this commission report authoritatively on existing facts bearing on immigration. Until now legislation on this subject has been embarrassed by the absence of the information which such a commission can obtain. The concluding portion of the section also empowers the President to call an international conference or to send special commissioners to any foreign country for the purpose of regulating by international agreement the immigration problems.

Section 40 provides for the creation of a division of information in the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. One of the evils of the present system is that there is not a proper distribution of immigration, and it is hoped that this division will assist in an equitable distribution.

Section 41 exempts accredited officials of foreign governments and their suites, families, and guests from the provisions of the act.

Section 42 is the air-space provision, which increases the amount of air space on each vessel by about 20 per cent. After this section takes effect on January 1, 1909, the requirements of the United States laws as to a proper air space for immigrants will be more liberal than those of any other country. Practically this is also a restrictive measure, as of course fewer can be brought on each ship, and, the number of ships being somewhat limited, fewer immigrants will come. The changes in this section are as follows:

Minimum cubic feet, 7 feet between decks.	
Present law:	Cubic feet.
Main deck, or first deck below	100
Second deck below	120
Proposed amendment:	
Main deck, or first deck below	126
Second deck below	140
Less than 7 feet between decks.	
Second deck below	120
Proposed amendment, second deck below (about)	180

Sections 43 and 44 are purely formal sections repealing all other immigration laws and laws conflicting with this new law and providing when the various parts of the law shall take effect.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GREGG, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING, ATHENS, OHIO.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 23221, and to pass the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous



consent to discharge the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds from the further consideration of the bill mentioned, and to consider the same at this time. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 23221) for the erection of a public building at the city of Athens, in the State of Ohio.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire for the United States, in the city of Athens, in the State of Ohio, in such manner as to him shall seem best, a suitable site, and cause to be erected thereon, according to plans and specifications to be approved by him, a substantial building, with good modern improvements and conveniences, for the post-office and other Government uses, at a total cost of not more than \$100,000, said building to be distant at least 40 feet in every direction from any other structure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. I object.

Mr. PAYNE. I trust the gentleman will not object after three recognitions have been given on that side.

Mr. HEFLIN. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The following is a statement which I will print as a part of my remarks:

#### CERTIFICATE.

This is to certify that at a meeting of the Athens Commercial Club held on the 28th day of November, 1906, a committee consisting of Frank S. Roach, L. H. Clark, and C. L. Jones was appointed to secure a census of the city of Athens, Ohio; that said committee appointed J. A. Palmer and L. H. Clark as enumerators, and that the report of said enumerators in the taking of said census, showing the name and street of each person living in the territory canvassed, are on file with the Athens Commercial Club and open to public inspection.

ATHENS COMMERCIAL CLUB,  
By H. G. STALDU, President.  
M. B. LAWRENCE, Secretary.

#### MAYOR'S CERTIFICATE.

I, Gilbert E. Day, mayor of the city of Athens, Ohio, hereby certify that I am well acquainted with the inhabitants of the city; that the canvass taken under the direction of the Athens Commercial Club was made by J. A. Palmer, a retired merchant, and L. H. Clark, an attorney, and that, in my opinion, the number of inhabitants shown by said census is correct.

GILBERT E. DAY, Mayor.

ATHENS, OHIO, December 26, 1906.

Report of committee on taking the census of Athens and contiguous territory:

Precinct No. 1	1,325
Precinct No. 2	1,225
Precinct No. 3	1,176
Precinct No. 4	966
Precinct No. 5	1,110

Total in corporation 5,802

Contiguous territory:	
Richland	214
Mechanicsburg	138
Stringtown	21
Asylum employees	152
Barth's Mill	30
Children's Home	62
Herrold's Mill	60
Patients at asylum	1,294
	1,931

Grand total 7,733

I hereby certify that the above amounts are a true census of the different places.

FRANK S. ROACH,

Chairman of Census Committee of Athens Commercial Club.

#### ELECTION STATISTICS.

Ohio election statistics for 1905 show the total number of votes cast in the city of Athens to be as follows:

Ward 1	316
Ward 2	326
Ward 3	257
Ward 4	411
Total	1,310

NOTE.—Ward 4 has since been divided into Wards 4 and 5.

#### SUMMARY.

Official census for corporation, 1900	3,066
Special census for corporation, 1905	5,151
Special census for corporation, 1906	5,802
Special census for corporation (and suburbs), 1906	7,733

*Post-office statistics.*—Four city carriers, nine rural carriers; receipts for year ending December 31, 1906, \$17,801.81.

In addition there is located in the little city of Athens the internal-revenue collector's office, the jurisdiction of which covers a very wide scope of Ohio, including Columbus and much of the contiguous country. So that in estimating the necessity for a public building it is easily seen that the location is a very favorable one: three railroads, running east and west and north and south, come to Athens; ten passenger trains pass Athens a day going east and west and six a day going north and south. Furthermore, Athens is located in the very heart of the great coal development of Ohio, a business which is rapidly growing in that immediate locality.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table. [Applause.]

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report on the bill H. R. 24815, the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report be omitted and the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### STATEMENT.

The House recedes from amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21 with amendment, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30 with amendment, 31, 32, 33, 34 with an amendment, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43 with an amendment, 46, 47, 48 with an amendment, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66, 70 with an amendment, 73, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, and 89.

The Senate recedes from amendments Nos. 4, 13, 50, 52, 56, 57, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, and 79.

Amendment No. 1 appropriates \$12,000 for the salary of the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with the law recently passed.

Amendment No. 2 increases the salary of the Assistant Secretary from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

Amendment No. 3 increases the salary of the solicitor to \$3,500.

Amendments Nos. 10, 15, 26, and 36 increase the salaries of the Chiefs of the Bureaus of Animal Industry, Plant Industry, Chemistry, and Forestry to \$5,000.

Amendment No. 73 restores the salary of the Director of Office of Public Roads to \$2,750, the amount originally recommended by the House committee.

Amendment No. 16 increases the salary of the chief clerk of the Bureau of Plant Industry to \$2,250.

Amendment No. 53 increases salary of the cashier of the division of disbursements and accounts to \$2,000.

Amendment No. 12 increases the amount for experiments in animal feeding and breeding from \$25,000 to \$50,000. This was the amount originally proposed by the House bill.

Amendment No. 20 increases the appropriation for grain investigations from \$15,000 to \$40,000. The increase was conceded by your conferees to meet the demands for foreign commerce.

Amendment No. 31, granting an increase of \$1,000,000 to the Forest Service, was agreed to by your conferees because of a Senate amendment which requires all receipts from the forest reserves to be turned into the Treasury, and not to be again available by the Forest Service except by direct appropriation.

Amendment No. 34 requires the Secretary of Agriculture to submit detailed reports of receipts and estimates for the Forest Service and estimate of expenditures intended for this service each year, and that all receipts from the Forest Service after July 1, 1907, shall be covered into the Treasury, thus putting an end to the use of those receipts as a "revolving" fund. This amendment further provides that hereafter no forest reserves shall be created nor any additions made within the limits of the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, or Wyoming except by act of Congress.

Amendment No. 41 strikes out that provision of the House bill which provides "that no part of this sum shall be used for the payment of compensation or expenses to any officer or other person employed by any State, county, or municipal government," and substitutes the following: "That any sum used for compensation of or payment of expenses to any officer or other person employed by any State, county, or municipal government shall be reported to Congress in detail."

The Senate amendment was agreed to by your conferees in the belief that it would be perhaps wiser to allow the Department to follow its own plan for at least the first year of the enforcement of the pure-food law.

Amendment No. 48 restores to the bill the salaries for the Bureau of Biological Survey exactly as it is carried in the current bill.

Amendment No. 70, as amended by the conferees, instead of restoring the item for nutrition investigations, appropriates \$5,000 to bring to Washington the apparatus belonging to the Government which has been used in these investigations.

Amendment No. 89 provides that hereafter on or before the 1st day of January of each year the Secretary of Agriculture

shall submit to Congress, in addition to the estimates now required by law, classified and detailed estimates of every subject of expenditure intended for the Agricultural Department for the next fiscal year and detailed reports of all expenditures under any appropriation for each service during the preceding fiscal year.

All other amendments are for correction of totals, slight changes in verbiage, correction of punctuation, restoration of two or three paragraphs stricken out in the House on points of order, but which in no way change the original intent and purpose of the bill.

On careful examination of the bill by the conferees it was found that no authority was given the Forest Service to employ help in the District of Columbia, the words authorizing such employment having been inadvertently stricken from the House bill under a point of order. The conferees therefore recommend the insertion, after the word "forests," in line 6, page 40 of the bill, of the words "in the District of Columbia or elsewhere."

J. W. WADSWORTH,  
CHAS. F. SCOTT,  
JOHN LAMB,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

#### SATISFACTION OF CLAIMS.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up conference report on the bill (H. R. 13605) to satisfy certain claims against the Government arising under the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13605) to satisfy certain claims against the Government arising under the Navy Department, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment striking out paragraphs 32, 33, and 34, and also its amendment to the title of the bill.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the following Senate amendments and agree to the same, namely:

To pay John H. Lohman the balance due him on account of bounty accruing by the destruction of the enemy's vessels at the battle of Santiago, July third, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, he being there and then an acting gunner, whereas he was allowed and paid bounty as chief gunner's mate only, fifty-nine dollars and twenty cents.

To reimburse Capt. E. J. Dorn, United States Navy, retired, in the amount expended by him as disbursing officer at the naval station, Tutulla, in June, nineteen hundred and one, and checked against his account because the vouchers representing such expenditures have been lost, four hundred and eighty-three dollars and nine cents.

J. M. MILLER,  
G. E. WALDO,  
JACK BEALL,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

C. W. FULTON,  
JOHN KEAN,  
A. J. McLAURIN,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement in reference to this bill. I desire to call attention of the House to the fact that this House has passed 144 bills coming from the Committee on Claims, and notwithstanding it is more than twice the number of bills ever passed by any Congress in the history of the country, the amount of the appropriations necessary to pay these claims is much less than any former appropriation. And at this time I desire to thank the Speaker of the House and the Members of this body for the splendid treatment they have accorded to small and deserving claimants, or creditors, of the country, and especially for the treatment accorded to the Committee on Claims. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

#### JICARILLA RESERVATION.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up conference report on the bill H. R. 23650, entitled "An act to quiet

title to lands on Jicarilla Reservation, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cause allotments to be made, and to dispose of the merchantable timber, and for other purposes."

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I introduced, on the 26th of January, a joint resolution that called for a reprint of the Special Report on the Disease of the Horse, and the Committee on Printing—

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HEFLIN. And the Committee on Printing, Mr. Speaker, reported the bill.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have not finished, Mr. Speaker, and I desire to finish my inquiry.

The SPEAKER. It is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have not finished yet, Mr. Speaker, and I desire to inquire now, in order that I may serve notice on others, that I may object, whether it may be in order to call up later this resolution, which is No. 229. Three-fourths of the House requested the committee to report it favorably.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the conference report on the bill H. R. 23650, presented by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. MARSHALL].

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 23650, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment to section three.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to sections one and two and agree to the same.

THOMAS F. MARSHALL,  
CHAS. H. BURKE,  
WM. T. ZENOR,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

MOSES E. CLAPP,  
CHARLES CURTIS,  
H. M. TELLER,

*Conferees on the part of the Senate.*

The statement is as follows:

The conferees on the points of difference between the two Houses on H. R. 23650 beg leave to report:

That the Senate recedes from its amendment to section 3, and thus leaves the bill in that particular as it passed the House.

The House recedes from the Senate amendment to section 1, which strikes out a surplusage of language and is fully covered by the proviso inserted by the Senate which previously formed section 2 of the bill as it passed the House, and section 2 is stricken out by the Senate because of the proviso mentioned, leaving the bill in this particular precisely as it passed the House.

THOMAS F. MARSHALL,  
CHAS. H. BURKE,  
WM. T. ZENOR,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MARSHALL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER, AT SHREVEPORT, LA.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25885) to extend the time for building a bridge across Red River, at Shreveport, La.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25885) to extend the time for building a bridge across Red River, at Shreveport, La.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WATKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.



## ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 25483. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes.

## DAM ACROSS COOSA RIVER, ALABAMA.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up from the Speaker's table and put upon its passage the bill S. 8526, with the amendment that has been agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, with the amendment, a bill which has been heretofore read.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the amendment be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, strike out all after line 3, down to and including line 14, page 5, and insert:

"SEC. 3. That this act shall be null and void unless the dams herein authorized be commenced within three years and completed within seven years from the time of the passage of this act."

"SEC. 4. The authority herein conferred, shall, except as herein specifically provided, be subject in all respects to the provisions of the act 'An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters,' approved June 21, 1906.

"SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BURNETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## METLAKAHTLA INDIANS.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 8299.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 8299) to confer civic rights on the Metlakatla Indians of Alaska.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That all Indians of the Tsimpsian or Haida tribe of the full or mixed blood who emigrated from British Columbia and settled at Metlakatla on Annette Island, in southeastern Alaska, in the year 1887 and subsequent years, as well as all descendants of such Indians, and all other Indians who have since become and remained bona fide residents of said Metlakatla, Alaska, shall, if otherwise qualified, be entitled to receive and obtain licenses as masters, pilots, and engineers, as the case may be, of any and all steamboats and other craft, and also licenses as operators of motor boats and other craft, subject to the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 16, 1906, entitled "An act to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, regulation of motor boats," with the same force and effect as if they had been citizens of the United States; any such Indian may be the owner of any such motor boat or other craft, subject to the provisions of the said act of May 16, 1906, although such Indian be not a citizen of the United States, without depriving said motor boat or other craft of the benefits and privileges of a vessel of the United States.

SEC. 2. That a certificate under the hand of any officer of the customs in Alaska, to the effect that the applicant for one of the different licenses mentioned in the foregoing section comes within one of the provisions of said first section of this act, shall together with the affidavit of the applicant to that effect, be sufficient evidence of the fact that said applicant is entitled to the privileges conferred upon said Indians by the first section of this act.

SEC. 3. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Mr. SULZER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the introducer of this bill if this is approved by Father Duncan?

Mr. ESCH. It is approved by the Secretary and the Commissioner.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is in the interest of Mr. Duncan's Indians.

Mr. SULZER. That is what I wanted to know.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## ALLOTMENT OF LAND IN SEVERALTY TO INDIANS.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following bill:

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25741) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of land in severalty," etc., approved February 8, 1901.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of the proviso of section 3 of the act of February 28, 1901, being an act to amend and further extend the benefits of the act approved February 8, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of land in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States over the Indians, and for other purposes," authorizing the leasing for grazing and mining purposes of Indian reservation

lands occupied by Indians who have bought and paid for the same, are hereby made applicable to lands embraced within any Indian reservation established by act of Congress or Executive order.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 4 strike out the words "nineteen hundred and one" and insert "eighteen hundred and ninety-one."

Mr. SULZER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if this applies to lands of the Indians in the State of New York?

Mr. SHERMAN. It does not.

Mr. SULZER. Then I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## COMPENSATION OF INSPECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12222) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the compensation of inspectors of customs.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to limit and fix the compensation of inspectors of customs as he may think advisable, not to exceed in any case the rate of \$5 per diem, and in all cases where the maximum compensation is paid no allowance shall be made for meals or other expenses incurred by inspectors when required to work at unusual hours.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects to the consideration of the bill.

## LEONARD MARTIN COX.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 25883.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25883) to reinstate Leonard Martin Cox in the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to restore, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Leonard Martin Cox, formerly a civil engineer in the United States Navy, to the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy, to take rank next after Civil Engineer Fred Thompson: *Provided*, That said Leonard Martin Cox shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, by examination pursuant to law, his physical, mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform the duties of that grade: *And provided further*, That the said Leonard Martin Cox shall be carried as an additional to the number of the grade to which he may be appointed under this act, or at any time thereafter: *And provided further*, That the said Leonard Martin Cox shall not by the passage of this act be entitled to back pay of any kind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope the gentleman will reserve his objection for just a moment.

Mr. MANN. It is late. I will talk with the gentleman later.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am doing this at the instance of the Secretary of the Navy. It is nothing that I desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

## TRENT RIVER, NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 253, relating to securing a channel of 6 feet depth over Foys Flats in the Trent River, North Carolina, about 4 miles above Newbern.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I object, and I shall continue to object during the rest of the evening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

## JOHN ALLEN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 13122) to correct the military record of John Allen, with Senate amendments thereto.

Mr. DEEMER. I move to concur in the Senate amendments. The motion was agreed to.

## PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 25039) to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Arizona Territory, to use the proceeds of certain municipal bonds for the purchase of the plant of the Phoenix Water Company

and to extend and improve said plant, with Senate amendments thereto.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

#### INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO MINORS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 23556) prohibiting the purchase, procurement, sale, gift, or disposition of intoxicating liquors to minors by unlicensed persons, with a Senate amendment thereto.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

#### RETURN OF BILLS TO THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following:

##### IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the President be requested to return the bill (S. 5623) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Nicholas M. Hawkins."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Also the following:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the President be requested to return the bill (S. 7822) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to William N. Brunson."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

#### VALLEY FORGE PARK COMMISSION.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25812) to authorize the Secretary of War to deliver certain brass fieldpieces, with their carriages and equipments, to the Valley Forge Park Commission.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] has given notice of his intention to object.

Mr. NEEDHAM. The gentleman from Massachusetts is considering the question of withdrawing his objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am not going to object, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary inquiry, however, if the Chair will indulge me. Will it be in order to call up, under suspension of the rules, the bill which has been objected to? If so, I should like to draw conclusions with the gentleman from New York on the merits of the proposition.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair does not, to-night at least, think it is feasible to recognize the gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Arkansas rise?

Mr. WALLACE. To ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 25557, which has been reported by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER], who first addressed the Chair. The Clerk will report the bill which the gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to consider.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25812) to authorize the Secretary of War to deliver certain brass fieldpieces, with their carriages and equipments, to the Valley Forge Park Commission.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to deliver to the Valley Forge Park Commission, for the ornamentation of the grounds of Valley Forge Park, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, twenty-five brass fieldpieces, with their carriages and equipments, now in the possession of the United States, the same to become the property of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the purpose aforesaid: *Provided,* That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for the delivery of said articles.

With the following amendments:

Line 4, after the words "authorized to," insert "loan and."

Line 6, after "Pennsylvania," strike out "25" and insert "10."

Line 7, strike out "with their carriages and equipments."

Lines 8 and 9, strike out "become the property of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the purpose aforesaid" and insert "be subject at all times to the order of the Secretary of War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent, the title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to loan and deliver certain brass fieldpieces to the Valley Forge Park Commission of the State of Pennsylvania."

#### RELINQUISHMENT OF CERTAIN LAND IN PENSACOLA, FLA., TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 360) to relinquish the interest of the United States in and to certain land in the city of

Pensacola, Fla., to the Right Rev. Edwin P. Allen, Catholic bishop of the diocese of Mobile, Ala., and his successors, in trust for the Catholic congregation of Pensacola, Fla.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That all the interest of the United States in and to the land in the city of Pensacola, in the State of Florida, known and described on the plat of said city of Pensacola as lots 1 and 2, between the squares and the lot on the east side of the Square of Ferdinand the Seventh, known as the Catholic Church lot, is hereby relinquished and released to the Right Rev. Edwin P. Allen, Catholic bishop of the diocese of Mobile, Ala., trustee for the Catholic congregation of Pensacola, Fla., and his successors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LAMAR, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### ANDREW B. BAIRD AND JAMES S. BAIRD.

By unanimous consent reference of the bill (H. R. 25487) for the relief of Andrew B. Baird and James S. Baird and to confirm all sales and dispositions heretofore made by the United States out of the confiscated land of the late Spruce M. Baird, their father, known as "Baird's Ranch," in the Territory of New Mexico, was changed from the Committee on War Claims to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### COPYRIGHT BILL.

Mr. BARCHFELD, by unanimous consent, was given leave to file the views of the minority of the Committee on Patents on the bill H. R. 25133—the copyright bill.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for the evening, on account of sickness.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF RIVERS AND HARBORS.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 25872, creating a commission to consider and recommend legislation for the improvement of rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. DALZELL and Mr. RAINEY both objected.

#### WILLIAM N. BRUNSON.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 8622, which is a corollary of the resolution recently passed to correct a mistake in a bill which had already passed both Houses.

Mr. CLAYTON. What is it?

Mr. DAWSON. It is a bill granting an increase of pension to William N. Brunson.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William N. Brunson, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DAWSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. LATTI, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President did, on the following dates, approve and sign bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 2, 1907:

H. R. 8984. An act to amend the laws governing labor or improvements upon mining claims in Alaska;

H. R. 9326. An act for the opening of Mills avenue NE. from Rhode Island avenue to Twenty-fourth street;

H. R. 10305. An act to provide for the repayment of certain customs dues;

H. R. 11040. An act to authorize the receivers of public moneys for land districts to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States certain sums embraced in their accounts of unearned fees and unofficial moneys;

H. R. 11044. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury, in certain contingencies, to refund to receivers of public moneys acting as special disbursing agents amounts paid by them out of their private funds;

H. R. 15320. An act to remove the charge of desertion standing against Peter Parsch;



H. R. 19524. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 19, 1906;

H. R. 21001. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter on the roll of Capt. Orlando Humason's Company B, First Oregon Mounted Volunteers, the name of Hezekiah Davis;

H. R. 21857. An act to correct the military record of Jacob Rockwell;

H. R. 22210. An act to correct the military record of Homer Quick;

H. R. 24390. An act to correct the military record of Charles H. Kellen;

H. R. 24605. An act granting the Norfolk and Portsmouth Traction Company the right to operate trains through the military reservation on Willoughby Spit, Norfolk County, Va.;

H. R. 24816. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the withdrawal from bond tax free of domestic alcohol when rendered unfit for beverage or liquid medicinal uses by mixture with suitable denaturing materials," approved June 7, 1906;

H. R. 24833. An act for the relief of the Louisiana Molasses Company (Limited) and the Louisiana Distilling Company;

H. R. 25630. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled 'An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia,' approved February 28, 1901," approved June 8, 1906;

H. R. 25738. An act to authorize the Cairo and Tennessee River Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River;

H. J. Res. 236. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish metal for a bell;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Henry O. Bassett, heir of Henry Opeman Bassett, deceased;

H. R. 8609. An act for the relief of James A. Carroll;

H. R. 10095. An act making certain changes in the postal laws;

H. R. 11401. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kling;

H. R. 13418. An act for the relief of W. S. Hammaker;

H. R. 15859. An act ceding certain lands to Colorado State Agricultural College;

H. R. 16659. An act to correct the military record of Tobe Holt;

H. R. 19751. An act to authorize the Natchez Electric Street Railway and Power Company to construct and operate an electric railway along the national cemetery roadway at Natchez, Miss.;

H. R. 22588. An act for the relief of homestead entrymen who have paid more than the lawful purchase money;

H. R. 23556. An act prohibiting the purchase or procurement, sale, gift, or disposition of intoxicating liquors to or for the use of minors by unlicensed persons;

H. R. 25437. An act to grant American registry to the German bark *Mariechen*;

H. R. 25474. An act to amend sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same;"

H. R. 25692. An act to provide for an additional district judge for the northern district of California;

H. R. 25739. An act to authorize the Cairo and Tennessee River Railroad Company to construct bridges across Cumberland River;

H. R. 25801. An act granting an honorable discharge to Seth Davis;

H. R. 25849. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Cherokee shoals;

H. R. 25811. An act to authorize the Monroe, Farmerville and Northwestern Railway Company to construct a bridge over the Ouachita River and one over the D'Arbonne River, in Louisiana;

H. R. 25832. An act to authorize Herman L. Hartenstein to construct a dam across the St. Joseph River near the village of Mottville, St. Joseph County, Mich.; and

H. R. 25885. An act to extend the time for building a bridge across Red River at Shreveport, La.

On March 4, 1907:

H. R. 24815. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908;

H. R. 13605. An act to satisfy certain claims against the Government arising under the Navy Department;

H. R. 25889. An act to provide for sittings of the United States circuit and district courts of the southern district of Ohio, at the city of Dayton in said district;

H. R. 13566. An act to amend the national-banking act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16235. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver condemned brass fieldpieces to the city of Petoskey, Mich.;

H. R. 19275. An act for the relief of T. E. Boyt;

H. R. 23221. An act for the erection of a public building at the city of Athens, in the State of Ohio;

H. J. Res. 253. A joint resolution relating to securing a channel of 6 feet depth over Foys flats in the Trent River, North Carolina, about 4 miles above Newbern;

H. R. 24640. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes;

H. R. 25745. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes;

H. R. 25851. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for prior years, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 211. A joint resolution authorizing the transfer of the files, books, and pamphlets of the Industrial Commission;

H. J. Res. 219. A joint resolution providing for an increase in the number of copies to be printed of the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency;

H. J. Res. 229. A joint resolution to provide for the printing of 250,000 copies of the special report on the diseases of horses;

H. J. Res. 255. A joint resolution providing for the printing of 5,000 copies of House Document No. 651, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session;

H. J. Res. 256. A joint resolution authorizing the Attorney-General to print 850 copies of the session laws;

H. J. Res. 257. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to print 1,000 additional copies of the annual report of the Director of the Mint;

H. R. 3208. An act granting a pension to Isabel T. Borthwick;

H. R. 8727. An act for the relief of James W. Kenney and the Union Brewing Company;

H. R. 12623. An act granting a pension to Minnie C. O'Connor;

H. R. 13304. An act to provide a suitable memorial to the memory of Christopher Columbus;

H. R. 20490. An act for the relief of Frank J. Ladner;

H. R. 22182. An act to authorize W. D. Clay and others to select lands in lieu of lands purchased by the father of said parties from the United States Government and lost by said heirs;

H. R. 23650. An act to quiet title to lands on Jicarilla Reservation, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cause allotments to be made, and to dispose of the merchantable timber, and for other purposes;

H. R. 23988. An act to authorize a patent to be issued to Martin Sanders, widow of Levi B. Sanders, for certain lands therein described;

H. R. 24655. An act to authorize the legislature of Oklahoma to dispose of a certain section of school land;

H. R. 25039. An act to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Ariz., to use the proceeds of certain municipal bonds for the purchase of the plant of the Phoenix Water Company and to extend and improve said plant;

H. R. 25672. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Ox Bow Power Company of South Dakota to construct a dam across the Missouri River;"

H. R. 25719. An act to provide for the establishment of an immigration station at Charleston, in the State of South Carolina, and the erection in said city, on a site to be selected for said station, of a public building;

H. R. 25812. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to loan and deliver certain brass fieldpieces to the Valley Forge Park Commission of the State of Pennsylvania; and

H. R. 25883. An act to reinstate Leonard Martin Cox in the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy.

#### RETIREMENT OF ARMY OFFICERS.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of Senate joint resolution 91, adjusting the status of certain officers of the Army as to their period of service required by the act of Congress approved June 30, 1882, to entitle an Army officer to retirement on his own application, and that the bill may be now considered.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the period of service entitling an Army officer to retirement on his own application, as required by act of Congress approved June 30, 1882, shall include all

service rendered by such officers as cadets at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., or subsequent to graduation therefrom, or to service as commissioned officers of the Navy, or to both.

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes a. m.) the House was in recess until 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the cases of Martin H. Johns and sundry others against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of John A. Beaver, administrator, and others against The United States, dismissed for want of prosecution—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of heirs of Isaac Burnett and others against The United States, dismissed for want of jurisdiction—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Benjamin F. Fox against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the cases of William J. Pointevent and sundry other cases against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Charles H. Adams against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting a report in relation to the inquiry of the House as to the investigation of the *Larchmont* disaster—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the operations of the excise board for the license year ended October 31, 1906—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to the inquiry of the House, a statement relative to the work on the battle ship *Louisiana*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25853) authorizing the purchase of the historical art window, by Maria Herndl, of George Washington, and so forth, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8158); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EURLTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25872) creating a commission to consider and recommend legislation for the improvement of rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8159); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25812) to authorize the Secretary of War to deliver certain brass field pieces, with their carriages and equipments, to the Valley Forge Park Commission, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8160); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 8328) to permit the laying of two water pipes from Bayonne,

N. J., to Staten Island, New York, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8163); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21401) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase the McIntosh Reservation, in Carroll County, Ga., and erect a monument thereon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8164); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25885) to extend the time for building a bridge across Red River at Shreveport, La., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8161); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6447) to authorize the appointment of Acting Asst. Surg. George R. Plummer, United States Navy, as an assistant surgeon in the United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8156); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 8568) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna A. May, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8157); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 8585) for the relief of Charles W. Spalding, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8162); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25883) to reinstate Leonard Martin Cox in the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8165); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLESON and Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 25884) directing the fixing of a standard of cotton classification—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 25885) to extend the time for building a bridge across Red River at Shreveport, La.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) granting permission to Rear-Admiral B. H. McCalla to accept a medal from the King of Great Britain and the Order of the Red Eagle from the Emperor of Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 255) providing for the printing of 5,000 copies of House Document No. 651, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 256) authorizing the Attorney-General to print 850 copies of the Session Laws—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 257) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to print 1,000 additional copies of the Annual Report of the Director of the Mint—to the Committee on Printing.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the legislature of Washington, praying for legislative encouragement for the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, relating to revision of the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS: Memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin,



relating to the revision of the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Memorial of the legislature of North Dakota, relating to the proposed survey and drainage of the valley of the Red River of the North—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin in favor of early revision of certain schedules of the existing tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 25883) to reinstate Leonard Martin Cox in the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 25886) granting extension of letters patent—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A bill (H. R. 25887) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Painter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of various organizations in the States and the District of Columbia, against the Littlefield bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of citizens and organizations of Pennsylvania, for the Murphy eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of Lew Wallace Court, No. 63, Tribe of Ben Hur, of Meadville, Pa.; Legion No. 482, Order of the National Protective Legion, of Union City, Pa., and Springs Legion No. 854, Order of the National Protective Legion, of Cambridge Springs, Pa., against amendments Nos. 12, 17, and 18 to the bill H. R. 608, relative to classification of second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of the Cleveland Association of Credit Men, for 1-cent letter postage and reclassification of second-class postal rates—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Peace Association of Friends, of Philadelphia, for an international peace congress to supplement the permanent court of arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of Providence (R. I.) Legion, No. 1704, Order of the National Protective Legion, against the passage of the bill to amend and codify the statutes relating to the classification of second-class matter and the rates of postage thereon—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the International Mule Spinners' Association, of Lonsdale, R. I., in favor of the passage of the convict-labor bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Petition of Typographical Union No. 211, of Oshkosh, Wis., for bill H. R. 9853 (the copyright bill)—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Manitowoc (Wis.) Lodge, No. 194, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, against bill H. R. 13655 (the Littlefield bill)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Castle-Pierce Printing Company, Oshkosh, Wis., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association, favoring the Mann patent bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of the Peace Association of Friends, of Philadelphia, for an international congress supplemental to the peace arbitration court at The Hague—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: Petitions of Paradise Court, No. 220, and Eureka Court, No. 159, Tribe of Ben Hur, of Eureka, Ind., against amendment of the classification of second-class mail matter and postage thereon—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of the International Association of the Master House Painters and Decorators of the United States and Canada, for enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law relative to organized labor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Peace Association of Friends, of Philadelphia, for an international congress supplemental to the court of arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Moyer, Haywood, and

Pettibone Protest Conference, of Germantown, Pa., against the injustice of the legal procedure against Moyer, Haywood, and Pettibone—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of the International Association of Master House Painters and Decorators of the United States and Canada, for district attorneys of the United States to investigate irregularities of organizations of labor as well as of capital—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the United States grand jury of San Francisco, Cal., for a change of law so as to require shipping articles to be signed in the presence of a shipping commissioner—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEFLIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Benjamin Findley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of Rev. R. M. Kierman and Mrs. M. M. Kennedy, against sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Friendship Court, Tribe of Ben Hur, of Clarinda, Iowa, against House Document No. 608, to amend the statutes relating to classification of second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of Legion No. 1601 and Legion No. 24, against the passage of a bill to amend and codify the statutes relative to classification of second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Benjamin Heath—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McNARY: Petition of the Appalachian Mountain Club, for an appropriation to enable the Department of the Interior to protect forests from destruction by fire—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACON: Resolution of the Farmers' Cooperative and Educational Union, for bill H. R. 23208, relative to dealing in futures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative unions of Poinsett County, Ark.; Wheatley, Ark., and Craighead County, Ark., and Local Union No. 1338, for bill H. R. 20554, relative to speculation in futures in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Mr. Stade, for legislation giving to each State the right to ditch into, alter, or destroy part or whole of any meandering lake or navigable river—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana: Petition of the International Association of Master House Painters and Decorators of the United States and Canada, for district attorneys to investigate improper activities of labor organizations in restraint of business—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the German-American Veterans' Association, of Indianapolis, against the deprivation of the old soldiers of the luxury of the army canteen and indorsing the actions of Congressmen OVERSTREET and FREDERICK LANDIS relative to the same—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of the Farmers' Club, of Silver Springs, Md., for extension of Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Sixteenth streets, Washington City—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of Max Schermer Lodge, No. 3, I. O. B. Sh., against section 2 of the immigration law and against the proposed addition to section 25—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of the International Association of Master House Painters and Decorators of the United States and Canada, for enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law relative to labor organizations—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Peace Association of Friends, of Philadelphia, Pa., for an international peace congress to supplement the permanent court at The Hague—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fordyce, Ark., et al., for the Littlefield bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of the Protest Conference of Philadelphia, against the persecution of Moyer, Haywood, and Pettibone—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the International Association of Master House Builders, Painters, and Decorators, for enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law relative to labor organizations as well as capitalist organizations—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Legion No. 714 and Legion No. 414, against passage of a bill to amend and codify the statutes relating to classification of second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SIMS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Hartwell D. Stovall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of citizens of Menard and Kimble counties, Tex., for legislation to prevent speculation in futures in farm products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of F. Ex. O. E. U., No. 4084, of Pilot Point, Tex., for a law to prevent gambling in futures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Peace Association of Friends, of Philadelphia, for an international congress supplemental to the peace court of arbitration at The Hague—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of the Jefferson Club, of Milwaukee, indorsing the substitute bill in form of an amendment, by Senator LA FOLLETTE, relative to the hours of railway employees—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of the German-American Central Verein, of Trenton, N. J., against bill H. R. 13655 (the Littlefield bill)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

SUNDAY, March 3, 1907.

[Continuation of legislative day of Saturday, March 2, 1907.]

At the expiration of the recess (11 a. m. Sunday, March 3) the Senate reassembled.

Mr. JOSEPH W. BAILEY, a Senator from the State of Texas, appeared in his seat to-day.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 360. An act to relinquish the interest of the United States in and to certain land in the city of Pensacola, Fla., to the Right Rev. Edwin P. Allen, Catholic bishop of the diocese of Mobile, Ala., and his successors, in trust for the Catholic congregation of Pensacola, Fla.;

S. 7812. An act to amend section 591 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the assignment of district judges to perform the duties of a disabled judge;

S. 8299. An act to confer civic rights on the Metlakahla Indians of Alaska;

S. 8498. An act to amend sections 16, 17, and 20 of an act entitled "An act to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and state government and be admitted into the Union;" and

S. 8622. An act granting an increase of pension to William N. Bronson.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 6147. An act authorizing changes in certain street railway tracks within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 7247. An act to provide for the establishment of an immigration station at New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, and the erection in said city, on a site to be selected for said station, of a public building;

S. 8327. An act to provide for the establishment of an immigration station at Galveston, in the State of Texas, and the erection in said city, on a site to be selected for said station, of a public building; and

S. 8526. An act permitting the erection of a dam across Coosa River, Alabama, at the place selected for Lock No. 12 on said river.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

H. R. 13122. An act to correct the military record of John Allen;

H. R. 13566. An act to amend sections 6 and 12 of the currency act approved March 14, 1900;

H. R. 16659. An act to correct the military record of Tobe Holt;

H. R. 23556. An act prohibiting the purchase, procurement, sale, gift, or disposition of intoxicating liquors to minors by unlicensed persons;

H. R. 25039. An act to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Ariz., to use the proceeds of certain municipal bonds for the purchase of the plant of the Phoenix Water Company and to extend and improve said plant; and

H. R. 25692. An act to provide for an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of California.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to

the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24815) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 25851) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for prior years, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LITTAUER, Mr. TAWNEY, and Mr. BRUNDIDGE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24640) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13605) to satisfy certain claims against the Government arising under the Navy Department.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 23650) to quiet title to lands on the Jicarilla Reservation, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cause allotments to be made, and to dispose of the merchantable timber, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate requesting the President to return the bill (S. 5623) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas M. Hawkins.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate requesting the President to return the bill (S. 7822) granting an increase of pension to William N. Bronson.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 25719. An act to provide for the establishment of an immigration station at Charleston, in the State of South Carolina, and the erection in said city, on a site to be selected for said station, of a public building;

H. R. 23221. An act for the erection of a public building at the city of Athens, in the State of Ohio;

H. R. 25741. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of land in severalty," etc., approved February 8, 1901;

H. R. 25812. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to deliver certain brass fieldpieces, with their carriages and equipments, to the Valley Forge Park Commission;

H. R. 25885. An act to extend the time for building a bridge across Red River at Shreveport, La.; and

H. R. 25889. An act to provide for sittings of the United States circuit and district courts of the southern district of Ohio at the city of Dayton, in said district.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

H. R. 13122. An act to correct the military record of John Allen;

H. R. 23556. An act prohibiting the purchase or procurement, sale, gift, or disposition of intoxicating liquors to or for the use of minors by unlicensed persons;

H. R. 23650. An act to quiet title to lands on Jicarilla Reservation and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cause allotments to be made, and to dispose of the merchantable timber, and for other purposes;

H. R. 25039. An act to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Ariz., to use the proceeds of certain municipal bonds for the purchase of the plant of the Phoenix Water Company and to extend and improve said plant; and

H. R. 25692. An act to provide for an additional district judge for the northern district of California.

### MARTHA SANDERS.

Mr. BERRY. I report back from the Committee on Public Lands without amendment the bill (H. R. 23988) to authorize patent to be issued to Martha Sanders, widow of Levi B. Sanders, for certain lands therein described, and I submit a report thereon. I am on a conference committee and compelled to go back, and I ask that the bill be put upon its passage.